

1981 IBS

VOLUME 3

JULY 1981



# BIBLICAL STUDIES

## IRISH BIBLICAL STUDIES

Editor: Rev Professor E.A. Russell  
Union Theological College  
Belfast BT7 1JT

Associate Editor: Professor Ernest Best, Dept of NT.,  
The University, Glasgow, G12 8QQ

Assistant Editor: Miss Anne McConnell, Union Theological  
College, Belfast BT7 1JT, N. Ireland.

### Editorial Advisory Panel

Professor David W. Gooding, Queen's University, Belfast.  
Revd Dr. David Hill, University of Sheffield.  
Principal R.J. McKelvey, The Congregational College,  
College Road, Whalley Range, Manchester M16 8B  
Revd Professor J.S. McIvor, Union Theological College  
Belfast BT7 1JT, N. Ireland  
Revd J. Murphy-O'Connor, L'Ecole Biblique, Jerusalem  
Revd J.S. McPolin, S.J., Milltown Park, Dublin 6.  
Professor Ernest Nicholson, Oriel College, Oxford  
Principal Vincent Parkin, Edgehill College, Belfast BT9 5B  
Mr David Payne, Queen's University, Belfast  
Professor Jacob Weingreen, Trinity College, Dublin 2.

---

### Subscriptions to be forwarded to the Assistant-Editor

The Journal will, normally, appear four times per year

ALL subscriptions are payable in Sterling only.

The price for 1980 will be:

Individuals: £5.50 sterling

Institutions: £6.75 sterling

---



# Contents

J.G. McConville, The Place of Ritual in Old Testament Religion	120-133
V. Parkin, "On the third day there was a wedding in Cana of Galilee" (John 2.1)	134-144
Guy Wagner, The Tabernacle and Life "in Christ", Exegesis of 2 Corinthians 5: 1-10	145-165
<u>Reviews:</u> John Gray, The Biblical Doctrine of God (D.R.G. Beattie); A.R. Millard and D.J. Wiseman (eds), Essays on the Patriarchal Narratives (D.F. Payne) ; Francis I. Anderson and D.N. Freedman, Hosea (W.G.E. Watson) ; J.C. Beker, Paul the Apostle (E. Best) ; E. Käsemann, Commentary on Romans (W.S. Campbell) ; James D.G. Dunn, Christology in the Making (E.A. Russell) ; R. Panikkar, The Unknown Christ of Hinduism (D. Kennedy)	166-177

The Place of Ritual in OT Religion

J.G. McConville

The Eclipse of Old Testament Ritual

It is usually the fate of the Old Testament's legislation on sacrifices and ritual to be quietly and piously consigned to oblivion. A number of factors conspire to produce this result. There is a feeling that the ritual slaughter of animals is barbaric, a feature of primitive societies only, and therefore meaningless in "civilization". This is perhaps only the most acute aspect of the wider difficulty that is commonly experienced in applying the Old Testament - and especially Old Testament legislation - to the modern world. The failure to confront sacrificial legislation as a part of the Bible which has relevance in its own right has also been encouraged by the belief among Christians that it has, in its entirety, been fulfilled or abolished by the sacrifice of Christ on the cross. This has often resulted either in the ignoring of sacrificial legislation, or in the allegorizing of it (and related subjects, particularly tabernacle and Temple), so that the various elements in sacrificial practice, not to say temple architecture, are explained minutely in terms of the theology of the atonement. /1

In Old Testament scholarship, the obfuscation of ritual has been more subtle. Influential scholars, such as Wellhausen, had a conception of religion which led them to drive a wedge between the 'ritual' and the 'spiritual', the latter being superior and the former a sign of degeneration. Wellhausen depicts the course of Israel's religious history as a decline from an early period when worship was spontaneous and free, untrammelled by regulations, to a later situation, culminating in the exile, when true spirituality was throttled by the need for a host of pedantic observances. /2 Passages in the prophets and Psalms were cited as evidence that those who really knew what they were talking about in religion saw the limited value of sacrifices (e.g. Jer 7:21ff., Ps 50:7-15). While there is greater recognition nowadays



that the prophets and psalmists did not intend to abolish sacrifices, the idea persists that "higher" religion is that which has risen above older ritual conceptions. /3 And some Protestant theologians have not been free from the charge of seeing the relationship between the two Testaments, on the question of sacrifice and ritual, not as a matter of fulfilment or abolition, but as the completion of a "spiritualizing" process that began with the prophets. /4

The aim of this article is to redress the balance somewhat. Not so as to argue for the re-institution of sacrifice! With regard to atonement Christ's sacrifice is "once for all" (Heb 10:11). But I do want to challenge the widespread antithesis between the spiritual and the ritual in religion, and to see if there is not after all some value for contemporary worship in the ritual life of ancient Israel. The conviction underlying the article is that ritual in the Old Testament is not merely an aspect of a passing phase of the divine economy - but that it belongs, in a fundamental way, to the intercourse between God and man.

### Signs in the Old Testament

Essential to the communication between God and man in the Old Testament is, of course, God's word. The giving and receiving of the word is the primary way in which God reveals himself. But very often the word is supported by something visual or dramatic. The prophets deliver the word of God. But Ezekiel, to take an example, accompanies his message of judgment upon Judah with various enactments of it. /5 (Indeed, for a period, the message of judgment is given only through these enactments, since Ezekiel is prohibited temporarily from speaking, Ezek 3:26f. The prohibition is lifted in 33:22. It may in fact never have been absolute, as the prophet does appear to speak from time to time, e.g. 14:1ff). These enactments, apparently, are more than mere visual aids. When, in ch.4 Ezekiel constructs a mini-Jerusalem under siege, he is also required to lie down next to it, first on his left side and then on his right, for an exceedingly long time

and bound with cords so that he cannot turn over prematurely (4:4-8). The discomfort of all this hardly needs elaboration. But it is not accidental. Ezekiel, it seems, is actually "bearing the punishment of the house of Israel" (v 4). This is not to say that he does so in any final or complete way. Nevertheless, there is a real connection of thought between this text and the representation of vicarious suffering which appears in Isaiah 53. /6 Ezekiel, therefore, in announcing punishment upon Judah, does so by means of a sign' ('ôṭ, v 3), in the giving of which he actually partakes of the suffering announced. /7 This in turn would become more than a simple 'visual aid' to the onlooker. Of course it would speak to the mind. But it would do so by beginning actually to realize the coming judgment. It does more than speak to the mind. It speaks to the whole person.

It may be questioned whether all the prophetic signs work in this way. /8 But there are undoubtedly other signs which do. The plagues on Egypt are described as such ('ôṭōṭay, Ex 7:3). /9 Their aim is that "the Egyptians shall know that I am the Lord" (7:5). The purpose of the plagues, right through to the slaying of the Egyptian firstborn, is to communicate that God is God and that he can deliver his people (7:17; 9:14-16). (It is to this aspect of the plagues that the Egyptian magicians seek to respond; rather than alleviating them, they try to reproduce them, thus aiming to show that there is nothing special about Israel's God (7:22) ). But the thing is not a matter of mere academic interest. Egypt has suffered in the plagues. God communicates to the Egyptians. But in doing so he also acts in judgment against them. This culminates in the death of the first-born of every family. A distinction is hardly possible here between the sign and the thing signified. Once again, God does not communicate in a merely cerebral way, but reaches into the experience of those whom he addresses at a more fundamental level.

### Word and Ritual

We now have to ask whether this non-verbal element in God's communication with man has any counterpart within



the religious, specifically the cultic, life of Israel. Once again the Passover is helpful. We saw that the plagues leading up to the Passover were called signs. But so too is the annual Passover ritual which is instituted as a result of God's activity in Egypt (Ex 13:9). The Passover ritual is a sign whose purpose is to keep before the Israelites God's action on their behalf in bringing them out of Egypt. Now, again, this 'sign' is more than a mere visual aid. The instructions given in Exodus 12 testify to a close link between the original event and the subsequent celebration of it. (Vv 1-13 relate to the night of the first Passover, and vv 14-20 the annual reminder of it). Event and celebration are, to be sure, kept separate. /10 Nevertheless, the provision for the annual re-enactment of the Passover was such as to make Israel come close, again and again, to the original experience. This is the purpose of the requirement to eat only unleavened bread, which, being the appropriate food for those on a journey, or about to leave on a journey in haste (Dt 16:3), would serve to create the sort of atmosphere which there would have been on the night of Israel's first historic departure. /11

Here, then, we begin to see one function of Old Testament ritual. The Passover does, no doubt, have an atoning significance, and it is this that is taken up in the New Testament when Paul refers to Christ as "our Paschal lamb". But it also functions in this quite distinct way, related to the matter of making God's presence real to men.

(In the midst of the ritual of Passover, it must be said, the importance of the word is not lost. When God gives instructions for the recurring Passover ritual (Ex 12) he does not omit the provision that succeeding generations shall say what it means, v 27.)

Does the Old Testament give a place to ritual celebration in general such as the Passover enjoys? To answer this let us look at two areas of the Old Testament, (1) those parts where there has often been said to be criticism of the ritual aspect of worship in the name of

a "higher" or more "spiritualized" religion viz. the prophets and the Psalms; and b) Deuteronomy, with its special incorporation of ritual into worship and theology.

### Psalms and the prophets

Among passages quoted in favour of the view that Old Testament religion outgrew sacrifice are Jer 7:21f ("...I did not speak to your fathers or command them concerning burnt-offerings and sacrifices"); Is 1:12ff ("Bring no more vain offerings; incense is an abomination to me.." v 13); Ps 40:6-8 ("Sacrifice and offering thou dost not desire..." etc. /12 In cases like these there is almost always some contrast between the offering of sacrifices and an attitude of proper devotion to God; e.g. Ps 40:8, "I delight to do thy will, O my God, thy law is within my heart." (And compare the immediate contexts of the other passages quoted).

It used to be held that sentiments like these signalled attempts to abolish sacrifice altogether, in favour of a more "spiritualized" religion. /13 Generally speaking this is no longer so. /14 Yet, as we have seen, the idea persists that they do indicate a gradual realization that "spiritual" religion was better than one based on ritual. /15 The argument is further supported from the Psalms by reference to some of the vocabulary used there. There are occasions when it is difficult to be sure whether a word refers to an act of sacrifice or to an act of worship without sacrifice. One example is the word tôdāh, which means "thanksgiving-sacrifice", but on occasion seems to mean simply "thanksgiving" (as, probably in Ps 147:7). In one case tôdāh is used, fairly clearly, in contrast to sacrifice: "I will magnify him with thanksgiving (tôdāh). This will please the Lord more than an ox, or a bull with horns and hoofs." (Ps 69:30f). In other cases it is not so clear whether the thanksgiving includes a sacrifice - e.g. Ps 50:14. (The same question arises in the case of the vows in the same verse. And are the "shouts" of Ps 27:6b the sacrifices themselves? or are they accompanied by real sacrifices?")



It cannot be denied that some of the passages cited appear to take a very negative view of sacrifice. The question is whether they intend to abolish it in favour of a "higher" kind of religion. This is not clearly the case. First, there are places in the Psalms where the offering of sacrifices does unequivocally accompany expressions of devotion very similar to those in which a contrast with sacrifice is made. Ps 66:13-20 illustrates this. Vv 13-15 declare an intention to offer burnt-offerings etc., (and this means that the "vows" of v 13 will be actual sacrifices too); and vv 16-19 show the need for a pure heart if the worship is to be valid and genuine. There is no essential conflict. And this would make us tend to suppose that, in the obscurities we have noted, actual sacrifices are also intended to take place. On the analogy of Ps 66:13ff., therefore, we have every reason to follow RSV in interpreting Ps 27:6b "sacrifices with shouts of joy" (even though the phrase literally "sacrifices of shouts of joy". Those who believe that sacrifice is being displaced in the Psalms tend to suppose the opposite. H-J. Hermisson (op.cit.) is one who does so. Hermisson's position is different from the more usual view of spiritualizing. He does not argue polemically against sacrifice in the Psalms. But he does see a movement in which what began as a complex of sacrifice and praise came to be represented by the act of praise alone. In principle, then, he sees no abolition of sacrifice. Yet in practice he sees it as disappearing, in a tendency which he can only call "Spiritualisierung", (pp.24ff.). Ps 27:6b Hermisson thinks that only shouts - without sacrifice - are intended, (p.51). But he interprets this passage by analogy with certain others which contain the expression zēbāh-tōdāh, and which he considers not to refer to an actual sacrifice. His general theory, therefore, dictates his treatment of particulars. Cf. also his interpretation of Proverbs 15:8, where he considers "sacrifice" and "prayer" to be in opposition to each other (p.122f.). In reality, however, this verse suggests analogy rather than contrast.

Secondly (and lest the above considerations be thought not to address the strongest statements against

sacrifice) it is significant that in the context of one such stronger statement there is also a condemnation of those who take the Lord's statutes upon their lips unworthily (Ps 50:16-21). Psalm 50 as a whole aims to produce an attitude of thankfulness. This is set in contrast both to the bringing of sacrifices and to the unworthy use of the words of the law. It is reasonable to interpret the first part of the Psalm by the second, and to suppose that as it is unworthy use of the law that is opposed, so also it is an unworthy use of sacrifice.

It should be noted also at this point that Hebrew typically uses strong language. That is to say, as G.B.Caird has pointed out, it tends to state things in a rather black-and-white, even extreme, way. Examples of this are those passages where the idea of hatred is invoked when the passion is really no more violent than loving one person less than another, e.g. Gen 29:30f. (This way of thought comes over into the New Testament in e.g. Luke 14:26). /16 Here is a further reason for thinking that the denunciations of sacrifice are really only denunciations of sacrifice as it was abused and rendered meaningless by the insincere. This interpretation becomes unavoidable in the light of Is 1:13b. After the apparently absolute opposition to sacrifice in vv 11-13a, 13b reveals the real state of affairs with the words "I cannot endure iniquity and solemn assembly". It is the presence of iniquity along with ritual celebration that is abhorred.

In fact, there always remains a place in Old Testament religion for ritual properly understood and practised. /17 It is only after the Old Testament period that we begin to have real evidence of traditional rituals losing ground, and then only in some circles. One such circle was the Qumran community, within which sacrifices were not offered. Indeed those who produced their literature took precautions to avoid ambiguity on the subject. For example, whereas the canonical psalms use the expression tôdâh sometimes for "thanksgiving" and sometimes for "thanksgiving sacrifice", the psalms of Qumran consistently prefer the term



šdāh, a near-synonym which, however, refers unambiguously to praise or thanksgiving without sacrifice. The men of Amran, of course, had very special reasons for excluding sacrifice. They were in a kind of exile from the Jerusalem temple, the only legitimate place of sacrifice. So the Amran attitude to sacrifice was pragmatic, not a sign of some inevitable growth away from ritual in Old Testament religion. /18

#### ) Deuteronomy's use of ritual

In the previous section we saw that the ritual side of religion persisted throughout the Old Testament, and was in no way to be regarded as characteristic of "primitive" religion only. We also suggested that the full meaning of ritual was not exhausted by its atoning effect.

It is this last point that we wish to pursue a little further, by looking at Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy differs considerably, in its presentation of sacrifice, from the book of Leviticus. Whereas Lev 1-7, for example, stresses very much the atoning significance of sacrifice, this aspect is almost entirely absent from Deuteronomy. (It is often noted that the sin-offering and guilt-offering are not even mentioned here). And this is because atonement does not find a central place (if any) in the theology of Deuteronomy. The sacrifices and other celebrations which are treated, in chs. 12-16, are used to support those themes which are central to Deuteronomy's theology./19 A useful example is the tithe (Dt 14:22-29). The law in Deuteronomy is so different from that in Nu 18:21-25 that many interpreters down the ages have resorted to the view that two quite distinct tithes were known in ancient Israel. /20 The difference is that Nu 18 apportioned the tithe to the Levite; while Dt 14 expects the household of the offerer to consume it themselves. It is not our present purpose to offer a resolution of this difficulty./21 Suffice it to say that Deuteronomy's law has a function in terms of the book's own purpose. Dt 14:23 shows that the purpose of the tithe is "that you may learn to fear the Lord your God always". There is a didactic element similar to that of the Passover, cf. supra). In the

celebration, the people's knowledge of God will be sharpened. But we can go further. The tithe-celebration, like those prophetic "signs" discussed above, is no mere visual aid, but becomes a part of the thing it signifies. Stressing as it does the participation of the offerer and his household in the sacral meal, it is related to that thrust of the book as a whole which insists that the people is on the verge of a good land, whose riches they are about to go in and enjoy (cf. Dt 6:13f., 8:7-10). It shows, therefore, that even in bringing their sacrifices, the people will be enjoying this promised bounty. And indeed it functions by affording an actual experience of the thing promised, (cf. the tithe-material - wine, oil and firstlings of herd and flock - with the description of plenty in 7:13). /22

It is not only in Deuteronomy that we can observe an identity between the sign and the thing signified. Gn 17:10 shows that a similar thought underlies the rite of circumcision. V 11 speaks of the rite as a "sign" of God's covenant with Abraham and his descendants; But v 10 refers to it as the covenant itself: "This is my covenant..." Once again, there is an identity between the sign and the thing signified.

### Conclusion: Ritual and Sacrament

Old Testament ritual celebrations, therefore, have characteristics in common with many Old Testament "signs". The signs (like the plagues, and Ezekiel's enactments of his message) were in themselves a means of communication between God and men which complemented and went beyond the capacity of the word (though were meaningless without an accompanying word). This complementarity appeared to belong in a fundamental way to that communication. The same can be said for ritual celebration, which, as we saw, always retained its place in Old Testament religion.

A second feature of the sign was that it partook of the thing signified, and this also could be said of some uses of ritual. When ritual celebration becomes in itself part of what God wants to say or do or give to man, we may call it sacramental.



At this point I want to suggest that there is not only a line running from Old Testament sacrifice to the atoning sacrifice of Christ, but also a line joining sacrifice and Old Testament ritual celebration in general, to New Testament sacrament. We have seen already that the meaning of the sacrificial ritual was not exhausted, in the Old Testament, by its atoning significance. It could function simply in giving a certain experience of the presence and character of God. And we saw that the ritual aspect of religion did not - as some have thought - become superseded by a "higher" concept of religion within the Old Testament period. It continued to belong fundamentally to religion. If Christ's death has abolished sacrificial practice, it does not follow that there is no further use in the divine economy for ritual celebration. This finds its expression particularly, I would suggest, in the Lord's Supper. Without venturing more than is necessary into eucharistic doctrine, the analogy, if accepted, would indicate a real identity of some sort between fullness of life in Christ and what is offered in the sacrament. When Jesus says "This is my body..." and "This cup is the new covenant in my blood," (I Cor 11:24f) part of the Old Testament background to it is the identity we have seen in ritual between the celebration and what it represents; (The equation of circumcision with the covenant, Gen 17:10, is a case in point). Similarly, the exhortation "do this in remembrance of me" (v 24) must reflect the sort of remembering which takes place in the Passover celebration, i.e. no mere cerebral act, but a recreation of the deliverance itself.

We have seen enough in this short study to show that the Old Testament analogies nowhere support an ex opere operato view of the sacraments. Nor is there Old Testament evidence for regarding it as a sacrifice. Yet the background might encourage rather higher expectations of it than are sometimes cherished in certain ecclesiastical traditions. /23\*

Notes

1. For an example of this sort of approach, see H.Bonar, Leviticus, London, Nisbet, 1875
2. In "Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel", Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1885.
3. See e.g. R.E.Clements, Old Testament Theology, London, Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1978, e.g.pp43f.
4. See the review of the positions taken by Sellin, Bertholet, Gunkel and Kittel in H-J.Hermisson, Sprache und Ritus im altisraelitischen Kult, Neukirchen, 1965, pp24-28.
5. E.g. Ezek 3:25ff; 4:1ff; 5:1ff; 12:3ff.
6. Cf W.Zimmerli, Ezekiel I, Philadelphia, Fortress, 1979, pp164f.
7. See again Zimmerli, *ibid.* J.B.Taylor's view that Ezekiel's act is "purely descriptive" is too weak an appreciation of the sign, Ezekiel, London, IVP 1969, p78
8. Certainly, not all signs do so. Some concordance work on the word 'ôṭ would reveal that it can have different kinds of significance. In Nu 17:3 (16:38EVV), it refers to the censers of Korah and his fellow-rebels, which were preserved as part of the furnishings of the tabernacle, and as a reminder of their owners' fate. "Sign" here probably bears a rather weaker sense, nearer the merely illustrative, than in the Ezekiel passage. This may be true of some of the prophetic signs, e.g. Jeremiah and his loincloth, Jer 13.
9. Also, incidentally, as mōṣṣay, "wonders", *ibid.*
10. I.e. there is no confusion of event and cultic representation such as is found in ancient near eastern mythologies, e.g. of creation. See J.Barr, The Meaning of 'Mythology' in relation to the Old



10. (contd) Testament", VT 9(1959),pp5ff.
11. It is sometimes said, too, that in Dt 16:7 there is a further attempt to recreate conditions of temporariness and transit in the instruction to return "to your tents". i.e. it seems that the celebrants actually dwelt in such temporary residences for the duration of the feasts, as they did at the Feast of Booths. (See A.D.H.Mayes, Deuteronomy, London, Oliphants, 1979, p259.)
12. cf. Pss 50:7-15; 51:16f; 69:30f.
13. e.g.H.Ewald, Commentary on the Psalms, London,1880, Vol I, pp 316f.
14. See e.g. J.H.Eaton, Psalms, London SCM 1967,p137.
15. See A.Weiser, Psalms, London SCM,p397 who seems to see a fundamental difference between religion based on prayer and that which is based on sacrifice. This, no doubt, reflects the commonest view of the history of Old Testament religion, according to which there were two contrasting trends as the centuries elapsed; the one towards increasing ritual encumbrance; and the other towards its complete rejection. This twofold tendency, however, makes it difficult to think in terms of a classical Wellhausenian unilinear development in Old Testament religion. (with increasing constriction reflected in the progress - or regress - from D to P). M.Weinfeld, feeling the difficulty, proposes that D and P give evidence of developments pari passu of rival schools, D being relatively freer of ritual and more ethically and humanely orientated, (M.Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the deuteronomic School, Oxford, Clarendon 1972, especially pp179ff. ) J.Milgrom, however, in a review of Weinfeld's book (IEJ 23,pp156-161) points out that it rests on false contrasts between Deuteronomy and other parts of the Pentateuch (P). Both Clements and Weinfeld accept in their different ways, a fundamental tension between ritual and spiritual religion.

16. On this whole dimension of Hebrew, see further, G.B.Caird, Language and Imagery in the Bible, London Duckworth, 1980, pp110ff.
17. The best witness to its true place is probably the book of Malachi, with its criticism of fraudulent sacrifice (1:6-14), encouragement to proper ritual observance (3:10), and its equal emphasis on the ethical (2:6f, 17; 3:5). Notice too expressions such as "a man of uncircumcised lips", where the physical rite becomes a key to understanding an inner condition, (Ex 6:12,30). The rite itself remains essential. This is probably also the case with fasting in Is 58:1-9.
18. It seems that some members of the community occasionally offered sacrifice in Jerusalem, under certain conditions; see G.Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, Harmondsworth, Penguin, pp45f. The community did continue a whole range of other ritual practices, *ibid.* pp44ff; cf. J.T.Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea, London, SCM, pp107ff.
19. A fuller exposition of the relation between Deuteronomy's theology and its rituals is undertaken in my thesis "Cultic Laws in Deuteronomy," Sheffield JSOT, forthcoming. The themes I have in mind are Israel's need to respond to Yahweh's action on their behalf, the imminent blessings of the land, the holiness of Israel, and her unity.
20. Witness the Talmudic tract *ma'áser šēnī*, or "second tithe"; and cf. C.F.Keil, Commentary on the Pentateuch, Grand Rapids, Eerdmann, 1975 (repr.), p356. Modern critics have taken the rather different view that Deuteronomy represents an earlier, and Numbers a later stage in the development of the same institution, see e.g. A.D.H.Mayes, *op.cit.* p246.
21. There is, in fact, no need to postulate a second tithe. By the same token one would have to postulate second firstlings also (cf.Dt 15:19ff with Nu 18:15-18).



21. (contd) I think the differences can be accounted for in terms of the different emphases of the contexts in Numbers and Deuteronomy. (See further "Cultic Laws in Deuteronomy.")
22. I believe a similar explanation is possible for the so-called law of profane slaughter in Dt 12:15ff.
- 23.\* Dr J. Gordon McConville is a Licentiate of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, former Librarian of Tyndale House, Cambridge and, at present, Lecturer in OT in Trinity Hall, Bristol, an Anglican Theological College. He is a Graduate in Arts of Cambridge, and in Divinity at Edinburgh. His Ph.D Thesis from the Queen's University of Belfast, on "Cultic Laws in Deuteronomy" is due to be published shortly by JSOT, Sheffield (Editorial Note)

"On the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee"  
(John 2.1)

V. Parkin

What is the significance of the time reference in this verse? Clearly it serves now to link the marriage at Cana with the events of the first chapter of the Gospel, and we shall not concern ourselves with any meaning that "the third day" may have apart from its bearing upon the number of days indicated in chapters one and two of John's work.

There have been differences of opinion about the day in the first chapter from which the third day is to be counted. According to R.E. Brown, Theodore of Mopsuestia counted the third day from the baptismal scene of 1.29-34. /1 But most writers count from the day on which Jesus said to Nathanael that he would see heaven opened (1.51). And this, the more obvious point from which to count, we take to be correct.

On the third day means two days later but, if we count these two days from 1.51, how many days are there in all from the first of the days in chapter 1, which must be the day on which took place the events of 1.19-28?

After the first day, successive days are clearly indicated by the phrase "the next day" at 1.19, 1.35 and 1.43, making, with the two days of 2.1, six days in all. It has, however, been suggested that, in addition to the days so clearly marked, another day has elapsed between 1.39 and 1.41.

When Andrew and the unnamed disciple came to Jesus and stayed with him, it was "about the tenth hour". This is usually taken to be the tenth hour from sunrise at 6 a.m. As sunset would follow in two hours the disciples stayed with Jesus. We are told that they stayed with him "that day". Westcott regarded the phrase "that day" as meaning "that memorable day", the day from which the Christian society took its rise. /2 While Schnackenburg mentions the possibility that the phrase may mean the following day as well, so adding another day to the total. /3

Other writers have also conjectured that another day must be added to the total, not because of any particular



significance attaching to the phrase "that day", but because of the supposition that the day after the meeting of the disciples with Jesus was the Sabbath when no long journey would be permissible. Although there is nothing to indicate the distance Andrew had to travel to find his brother, Simon Peter, for we neither know where Peter was nor where Bethany beyond Jordan was, it would be strange if the distance was not more than the 2000 cubits (little more than half a mile) which a Jew might travel on the Sabbath without breaking the commandment of Exodus 16.29 (interpreted by Numbers 35.5, which defined the suburbs of the cities of the Levites as stretching for 2000 cubits from the city walls). So, Brown writes, "The disciples had to stay with Jesus from 4 p.m. on Friday until Saturday evening when Sabbath was over, for they could not move any distance once Sabbath had begun on Friday evening." /4

Support for the conjecture that the day after the disciples met Jesus was the Sabbath is found, so it is claimed, in the Mishnah (Kethuboth 1) which states that the wedding of a bride who is being married for the first time should take place on a Wednesday. For if Andrew stayed with Jesus on the Sabbath and found Peter on Sunday, it would be Monday when Jesus decided to go to Galilee (1.43), and the third day after that would be Wednesday.

If we accept either the suggestion of Schnackenburg about the significance of the phrase "That day", or the conjectures about a Sabbath day's rest at 1.39f, the total number of days, up to and including the day of the wedding is seven.

There is also some textual evidence for counting another day besides those marked by the phrase "the next day". At 1.41, where the weight of manuscript evidence is in favour of reading prōton as the third word of the sentence, and there is also good support for reading prōtos, a few Old Latin texts depend upon an original proi, which may also be supported by the Sinaitic Syriac.

Bernard favours proi on the grounds that an original proi ton adelphon could easily give rise to prōton ton adelphon, that proi is a good Johannine word, being used again at 18.28 and 20.1, and that it gives good sense - "He finds early in the morning his (own) brother, Simon".

This reading implies that Andrew had stayed the night at the lodging where Jesus was. /5

We note that the day on which Andrew went out to seek for Simon cannot have been the Sabbath, so that the extra day which is yielded by the reading proi cannot have been the same day of the week, (extra to the ones indicated by the phrase "the next day") postulated by those who suppose that the tenth hour of 1.39 was just before the sunset which marked the beginning of the Sabbath.

Nevertheless, the views which accept proi as the correct reading at 1.41, and those which suppose that Andrew spent the Sabbath at Jesus' lodging, agree in yielding seven days in all, for the period beginning at 1.19 and continuing to 2.1.

It is also possible to arrive at a total of seven days without adopting either proi as the correct reading or the suggestion about the Sabbath rest, by supposing that a day was needed for travelling to Galilee after 1.43. The seven days of 1.19 to 2.1, however one arrives at that total, may correspond to the days of creation in Genesis 1 as, according to Bultmann, Quievreux argues. /6 It is, of course, possible, as Lindars says, to allow an extra day at 1.39f and also a day for travelling to Galilee at 1.43, so making eight days in all. /7

It seems reasonable to assume that the number of days has some significance in the pattern of the ministry described by John (Despite Schnackenburg's statement that "the third day" is probably a round number, so implying that the precise number of days is unimportant.) /8 But how are we to decide what the number is when, as we have seen, there have been mooted the possibilities of six days, of seven days, and of eight days?

We suggest that the essential step in reaching a conclusion is to recognize that for the purpose of discerning the significance of the number of days in John's pattern, we can only properly be concerned with the days John himself indicates. Deductions from geographical considerations of distances and the time spent in travel may be sound if one is concerned with the historicity of the material used by John, but irrelevant for any



consideration of the question to which we have addressed ourselves. There may have been a rest day in the ministry described by John in chapter 1, but it has made no contribution to John's scheme.

The story of the wedding at Cana may be based on fact and may correctly be associated with one particular day of the week or, as Dodd suggested, it may have grown out of a parable with no time reference at all /9, or even out of a timeless legend about Dionysus.

None of these possibilities affects the present issue. The only days to be counted are those given by John, and the only uncertainty arises from the textual variants at 1.41, whether John wrote proi, marking the early hours of another day, so adding an extra day to those indicated by him in other ways, or whether he wrote the better attested variants proton or protos, neither of which affects the number of days. No extant manuscript supports proi, and the support from the Old Latin and Syriac versions is slight. Despite this weak attestation, Bernard, as we have seen, favours this reading. As he argues, an original proi could easily have been altered by accident to proton. But it would have been almost as easy for an original proton ton adelphon to have been changed by accident to proi ton adelphon. And while it is impossible for proi ton adelphon to have been changed intentionally to proton ton adelphon, the reverse intentional change could easily have taken place since proton (first) leaves the reader wondering what Andrew did next.

A further argument against the originality of proi is that if John had intended to indicate an extra day one would have expected him to use te epaurion (the next day) as he does at 1.29, 35, 43. We conclude, then, that proton is original and no additional day is indicated, and the tally of days from 1.19 to 2.1 is not seven, nor eight, but six.

The division of the material in the first two chapters of the Gospel according to successive days is, says R.T. Fortna, the result of the superimposition by John of a plan of days on an earlier whole. /10 This view of the origin of the plan of days means that the plan is significant for

John. Even if Fortna's view is not completely accepted, and one supposes that John may have found some reference(s) to days in his source material, so that some of the details in the plan of days may not have originated with him, it seems clear that in its present form, the plan of days is undoubtedly significant for John.

The similarity of the opening phrase in the Gospel to the opening of the account of the creation in Genesis 1 has often been remarked, so it is not surprising that the days of John 1.19 - 2.1 have been compared with the days of creation. Thus, R.E. Brown writes, "Bernard, Boismard, Strathmann and others believe that in its frequent mention of days in chapter 1 and 2.1 the Fourth Gospel wishes to portray a week of seven days to open the ministry - a week beginning the new creation just as Genesis 1.1 - 2.3 frames the work of the first creation within a week of seven days". /11.

Brown goes on to give a possible schematization of the week in John, ending on Tuesday night/ Wednesday, the day regarded as fitting the statement in the Mishnah about the marriage of a virgin, so that Cana marks both the end of the first week of the ministry (seventh day) and, as a Wednesday the beginning of the next week (eighth day). On Brown's scheme, which allows for a Sabbath day's rest, the sequence of days which ended at Cana began on a Wednesday. And, according to the ancient solar calendar (followed in the Jubilees and in Qumran), the week always began on Wednesday.

There are a number of difficulties about this schematization. First, the opening words of the Prologue to the Gospel provide the only obvious verbal connection with Genesis 1 and they are rather far removed from John's account of the days which does not begin until John 1.19. Second, it is not easy to relate the events described by John on the days he mentions to the happenings on the days of creation in Genesis. Third, we have argued that only the days mentioned by John are to be counted and this yields only six days and not seven (Brown seems to want to count both seven and eight!).

In answer to these objections it may be urged that if, as Lindars states, the Gospel did not originally include the Prologue, /12 it is not surprising that John's account of the days does not follow swiftly upon the opening words



of what may have been an independent poem. But it does not allow that the ideas of the Prologue, whose opening words are reminiscent of the creation narrative, are unrelated to John's account of the days. Thus, "We have beheld his glory" (1.14) may be related to "...manifested his glory" (1.11), and the reference to believing in his name in 1.12 is also echoed in 2.11. Less obviously, the superabundance of wine provided by Jesus may be regarded as exemplifying the words "from his fulness have we all received". (1.16)

It is true that the days during which the Baptist testified and the first disciples met Jesus, seem unrelated to the events of the days of creation in Genesis, but ideas connected with a wedding are not unrelated to those of the day on which God created man and woman; blessed them and said, "be fruitful and multiply". Moreover, although the creation of man marked the day when the heavens and earth were finished and all the host of them, it is not on that sixth day of creation that God rested. Instead we read, "And on the seventh day God finished his work which he had done, and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had done". So day six at Cana which, as we have seen, picks up words and ideas found in the Prologue, not only looks back to day six of creation, it also points forward to the time when Jesus said, "It is finished" (19.30), after which he lay in the tomb on the seventh day. So the recognition that the days of John 1.19 - 2.1 are six in all and not seven does not destroy comparison with the week of creation. Indeed it may be regarded as enhancing it.

W.H. Brownlee states that in the Gospel there are three different six day periods, each of which begins at a place called Bethany, and each of which has as its climax a manifestation of glory. /13 The first of these is the one we have been considering, beginning with the Baptist in Bethany beyond Jordan (which Brownlee labels Bethany 1). The second begins with Jesus at Bethany 1 (10.40). There he cures the illness of Lazarus at Bethany near to Jerusalem (Bethany 2). On day six Lazarus is raised from the dead. The third begins with the anointing of Jesus at Bethany 2 (2.1) , and ends with the crucifixion.

Brownlee suggests that it is John's desire to emphasize this six day pattern which has caused him to name the place of the Baptist's activity Bethany. If this suggestion is

correct it is not surprising that the situation of this Bethany remains unidentified and that the name has been amended in some texts. Brownlee's treatment of the story of the sickness, death and resurrection of Lazarus as falling into a six day period is possible, perhaps even probable. Word was sent to Jesus of the illness of Lazarus. The journey took two days (conjecture). Jesus remained where he was for two days (11.6), then travelled to the home of Lazarus and his sisters, and this journey, like that of the messenger(s) took two days (conjecture) so that when Jesus arrived Lazarus had been in the tomb for four days (11.17) - this reconstruction requires Lazarus, who was ill when the message was sent by his sisters, to have died at the time the message reached Jesus. So we have six days from the sending of the message to the raising of Lazarus.

But if this period of six days had such significance in John's pattern of the ministry one would have expected him to indicate the length of time more clearly. Unlike the period stretching from 1.19 - 2.1 we cannot ascertain the number of days by adding together the days John mentions, for although he gives two days at 11.6 and four at 11.17, these cannot be added together because there must be some overlap. Indeed on the reconstruction given above the two days are completely included in the four. We therefore attempt no comparison between the sign at Cana and the raising of Lazarus.

Where, however, there are periods of six days clearly indicated by John, it is not unreasonable to see if there are significant parallels. If such parallels can be found, the story of Cana not only looks back to the creation narrative, but, as we have already suggested, to the crucifixion which, like the sign of the wedding, was on the last of six days. (We note that, according to John's chronology, the day on which Jesus died was the day on which the lambs of the Passover were killed, so that then there was actualized the title given to Jesus in the first period of six days, The Lamb of God 1.35 ).

The day of the wedding and the day of the crucifixion are linked by their references to the mother of Jesus, who, apart from these two scenes is not mentioned in this Gospel (except in the verse immediately following the story of the



bedding), .

At Cana and at Golgotha Jesus addresses his mother as "woman" - a perfectly respectful form of address, but nevertheless a strange one for a man to use to his mother. At Cana Jesus tells his mother that his hour is not yet come. At 13.1, before the feast of the Passover, Jesus knew that his hour had come to depart out of this world to the Father, and at 17.1 the hour is in immediate prospect and he cries "Father....glorify thy Son" which recalls the words of 2.11

Some who read John's account of the turning of the water into wine may have remembered the reference to wine in Psalm 104 where the writer blesses the Lord for his wonderful works in creation and for wine which makes glad the heart of man. But by the time John wrote his gospel, the thought immediately conjured up a reference to wine given by Jesus would probably be of the wine of the Eucharist. (That there is no account in this Gospel of the institution of the Eucharist cannot be taken as evidence that the sacrament was unknown or of little importance to the readers, especially since we have the sacramental discourse of 6.52-58). But the wine of the Eucharist represented the blood shed by Jesus.

In 1 John 5.8 we learn that there are three witnesses - the Spirit, the water, and the blood. All three are linked with the death of Jesus. From his pierced side there issued blood and water (19.34) . The Spirit was not given before Jesus was glorified (7.39) , and the glorification of Jesus was in his dying. So the evangelist, looking back to Cana, seeing the wine as a symbol of the blood to be shed, says, "Jesus manifested his glory".

If, as we have maintained, there are significant parallels between John's accounts of day six at Cana and at Golgotha, and especially if the marking of the days in chapters 1 and 2 is due to the redactor, it is possible that there may be some connection between the redactional verse 19.35 and the scene at Cana.

The reference in 19.35 to one who has borne true witness expresses a thought which has been prominent in the Gospel. As Lindars says, "In John's handling of the Gospel traditions, it is the chief function of the characters who

figure in the story to give witness to the truth revealed in Jesus". /14

The verse 19.35 speaks of one who is both an eyewitness and a testimony bearer. Both themes - seeing and testifying - are found in the six days up to and including the wedding at Cana. In the account of the wedding day nothing is said of witnessing in the sense of testifying, but those who see the glory of Jesus at Cana and believe, are those whose word will lead others to belief. (17.20) We ask ourselves whether these witnesses at Cana throw any light upon the question of the identity of the eyewitness of 19.35? Is he the beloved disciple or is he someone else? We proceed by asking how many witnesses there were at Cana and whether there was the same number at Golgotha.

In chapter 1 only five disciples are mentioned and on the assumption that, as with the days, we are to count only the number indicated, there were five disciples at Cana. At Golgotha, in all probability, four women stand by the cross and in addition there is the disciple whom Jesus loved (19.26). Since in a special sense the death of Jesus is his glorification (7.39; 12.26,23; 13.31f) there are at Golgotha these five who behold his glory. If there are parallels between Cana and Golgotha it suggests that, as there were five who saw the glory of Jesus at Cana, so there will be five at the cross, and the eyewitness of 19.35 must be one of the five and the identification of him with the beloved disciple is sound.

There is, of course, the difficulty that the effusion of blood and water from the side of Jesus which was seen by the eyewitness of 19.35 occurs after the beloved disciple has taken the mother of Jesus to his home (if we take "from that hour" (19.27) , to mean "from that moment") . But "that hour" may refer to the whole crucifixion narrative rather than just to the precise moment within the narrative when Jesus addressed the beloved disciple.

But there is also the problem posed by the position of Jesus' mother at Cana. Is she to be regarded there as one of the witnesses, as she is in the parallel scene at Golgotha? If the mother is a witness in both scenes, then at Cana we have six witnesses in all. If the number at Golgotha is comparable, the eyewitness of 19.35 is in

In addition to the group of five made up of the four women and the beloved disciple.

James the brother of the Lord became a leader of the Christian community, but at 7.5 we are told that Jesus' brothers did not believe in him. It is possible, therefore, that at Cana Jesus' mother was not yet a witness. This may be implied by the question, "O woman, what have you to do with me?" (2.4) And this in turn may continue the thought of the Prologue, "He came to his own home, and his own people received him not." (1.11). On the whole it may seem more probable that a group of five rather than six is indicated and that the mother of Jesus is not among the witnesses at Cana. But we cannot be certain and the enquiry into parallels between Cana and Golgotha does not enable us to say with confidence whether or not the eye-witness of 19.35 is the beloved disciple.

But we may wonder whether the consideration of parallels can form the basis for legitimate enquiry, or whether it inevitably leads to over-fanciful speculation. Must every detail at Cana have that which corresponds to it at Golgotha, so that for example we look at the later scene to find someone who corresponds with the steward at the feast!

Not everyone will draw the boundary of legitimate speculation at the same place. But it may be suggested that where we clearly have in the text the work of the redactor, where we are dealing with recurring themes in the Gospel such as seeing and witnessing and where, in the present form of the Gospel we have some indication of parallels such as the period of six days, we may reasonably ask whether one scene throws light on the other. The steward at the feast is not involved in the major themes of seeing the glory of Jesus and of witnessing to him and so would be excluded from this kind of enquiry by the criteria we have suggested.

Our conclusions to this enquiry into the implications of the statement, "On the third day, there was a marriage at Cana in Galilee" are that the day of the wedding is day six in the pattern John has given to his material; that the day is associated with day six of the creation narrative in Genesis 1 and also with day six of the Passion of Jesus; and more tentatively, that there are five witnesses at Cana and



also at Golgotha. The eyewitness of 19.35 is the disciple whom Jesus loved.

### Notes

1. R.E. Brown, The Gospel according to John (London 1971) p97
2. B.F. Westcott, St. John (London 1958), p24
3. R. Schnackenburg, The Gospel according to St John (London 1968, ET, I), p309
4. Brown, op.cit., p75
5. J.H. Bernard, St. John, (Edinburgh 1928), I p58.
6. R. Bultmann, The Gospel of John (Oxford 1971, ET) p119
7. B. Lindars, The Gospel of John (London 1972), p128
8. Schnackenburg, op.cit., p326.
9. C.H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, (Cambridge 1963), p227.
10. R.T. Fortna, The Gospel of Signs (Cambridge 1970), p189
11. Brown, op.cit., p105
12. Lindars, op.cit., p76
13. W.H. Brownlee, "Whence the Gospel According to John, in John and Qumran, Ed. J.H. Charlesworth (London 1972) p169.

The Tabernacle and Life "in Christ", Exegesis of  
2 Corinthians 5. 1-10

Guy Wagner /1

It appears to us that in this passage, noted for its difficulty, sufficient attention has not been given by commentators to the first verse. Here may be found, at the very beginning and, in particular, in the mysterious term skenos (tabernacle), what may be described as the problem of the text.

"For we know that if the earthly tent we live in is destroyed, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

O. Michel<sup>2</sup> remarks that the use of eschatological terms is especially surprising. More precisely, however, it is not the terms that are surprising but their use to denote the glorified body. Oikodome (building) denotes for Paul the edification of the Church or the Church itself over against the temple (1 Cor 3.9; 14.3,5; 2 Cor 10; 12.19; Eph 2.21; 4.12 and these do not include the passages where the verb oikodomeo is used). The term oikētērion (house) is found in the compound form katoikētērion (dwelling-place) in Eph 2.22 to denote also the Church compared with the temple. The term cheiropoiētos (made with hands) is a usual term in the OT to signify idols. In the NT, as we will see later, it describes the temple of Jerusalem, given over to destruction. Finally, skenos, synonymous with the feminine skene, is the term used both in the LXX and the NT to signify the tabernacle.

Is it necessary, in these circumstances, because oikia (house) at the start of the verse signifies the body to set aside all these texts to look for parallels in Hellenism or Gnosis? It seems to us a good method to explore the NT context first.

The Contrast: earthly temple - heavenly temple

Three passages which refer to the heavenly temple require our attention: Acts 7 (Stephen's speech), Hebrews 8 and 9 and Revelation 11.19 and 21. Among the manifestations of the divine grace in Israel, Stephen mentions the gift of the tabernacle, "Our fathers had the tent of witness in the wilderness, even as he who spoke to Moses, directed him to

to make it, according to the pattern that he had seen." (Acts 7.44). This is a clear reference to the text of Exodus 25.40, "See that you make them after the pattern... shown you on the mountain." Then, in Hebrews 8.2, we read, " (Christ is) a minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man." Then, in v5, before the express quotation of Isaiah 25.40 we read: (The Jewish priests) serve a copy and shadow of the heavenly sanctuary." It appears to us very likely, if not certain, that the author of the book of Acts has given a summary - a top brief - of an earlier text in which, as in the epistle to the Hebrews, the text of Exodus served to show that the tent set up by Moses was merely a human work, a copy of the invisible reality. But another equally significant comparison should be added to this. After recalling the entrance of the Ark into Palestine (Acts 7.48), Stephen continues: "David....asked leave to find a habitation (skēnōma) for the house (oikos) of Jacob. But it was Solomon who built a house (oikodomēsan oikon) for him. Yet the Most High does not dwell in houses made with hands." Then follows the quotation from Isaiah 66.1, "Heaven is my throne....what house will you build for me?"

Then, in Hebrews 9.11-24, it is affirmed that Christ did not enter a sanctuary made by hands, like the Jerusalem temple, but heaven itself. We know that Philo himself used this text from Exodus as a basis for his Platonic theology and the Rabbis, for their part, spoke of the heavenly temple copied by Moses. But their intention was to show that the copy, even if earthly, was still an authentic copy. For Christian texts, however, this is not the understanding. Here the emphasis is on the decaying nature of the temple and the tabernacle, as only transient tokens, doomed to destruction. For the origin of this opposition to the temple of Jerusalem it is certainly to the teaching of Jesus that we must turn, and it can be interesting to compare his attitude to that of the sectaries of Qumran. Such radically anti-Jewish calling into question of the temple, however, is supported by many OT texts. Texts like Isaiah 66.1, 1 King 8.27 and many others insist that every human work is only an approximate manifestation of the divine reality. God always transcends every object that would signify his presence. He reveals himself in eschatological times. In this



confidence Revelation 11.19 declares that then "God's temple in heaven will be opened and the ark will appear." At 21.22 it is said that there will no longer be any temple. It is only another way of saying the same thing. Heaven itself will be the temple or, more exactly, God himself will be heaven (v23). On the one hand, the tabernacle, like the temple, is a sign of the presence of God. That is why, in the heavenly Jerusalem, the tabernacle will be with men (21.3). But, on the other hand, the temple is a human work, i.e., not so much an inadequate sign as a reality of the ancient world. In this sense, it was disappearing.

The reader will have noticed the similarities in our verse with the various texts just quoted. It cannot be accidental that the terms: God's dwelling, house not made with hands, in the heavens, tabernacle, are linked together in these different passages. This shows that there did exist in primitive Christianity a group of speculations on the temple, sufficiently known and wide-ranging for us to find evidence in such diverse passages. We will have an opportunity to see that there are many other passages that continue this reflection. Thus we can explain the words Paul uses to introduce our verse, "For we know", where he makes a reference to a theme quite familiar to his readers.

### The temple and the glorious body

But these thoughts on the heavenly temple constitute only one approach to the difficulty. We have to ask now whether, in speaking of this dwelling, Paul was thinking of heaven as compared with the temple or of the glorious body which will be given to each believer. It cannot be denied that there is a certain indeterminateness in the expressions used by the apostle. Since this "dwelling" corresponds to the earthly house, the perishable body, it does seem that it has also to do with the glorious body. But is it necessary to choose between these two explanations?

A study of the eschatological thought of the early Christians shows that it is not descriptive. The event of the resurrection had the effect of placing the Christians in a situation where everything was made new.

Every human certainty was turned upside down and seen in a new perspective. Thus we can explain a certain incoherence in the terms used by the apostle and, generally, by the writers of the NT, besides the necessarily inadequate and indeterminate character of the images used. The resurrection of Christ, that divine intervention, placed a fundamental line of demarcation between what is divine and what is human: what God will do in his kingdom (and has already done at Easter) , and what man is and does in this passing world.

If we examine what Paul says of the glorified body in 1 Cor 15, we see that he is intent essentially on contrasting the future body with the actual body. Such corporeity is not put forward to show the identity of the individual under two successive aspects - this identity is simply assumed - but to indicate the reality of the divine work substantially achieved after the parousia. The adjectives - glorious, powerful, spiritual, heavenly, incorruptible, show that the new reality will be under the sign of the immediate presence of God. All that is under the sign of death will disappear. We will be truly in the heavenly temple. In the epistles as well as in Revelation we only find intimations of the world to come in order to show the divine nearness and the renewal that will issue from it. Our body as such cannot enter into the heavenly dwelling. Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God (1 Cor 5.50) . The body is doomed to total annihilation (kataluthē) and the new reality is beyond expression.

But it is necessary to mention other passages where the temple and the risen body are united or opposed and in particular Mark 14.58. O. Michel in the article quoted above raises the problem of the connections between this text and ours without giving an answer.

The verbal resemblances are striking. False witnesses come forward who affirm: "We have heard him say, 'I will destroy (katalusō) this temple made with hands and in three days I will build (oikodomeō) another not made with hands.'" The mention of three days is enough to indicate that we have a reference to the resurrection but John 2.19 comes in with a very important confirmation. After the account of the purification of the temple, which the author placed at the start of the Gospel to indicate its importance, Jesus declares, "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up." And since the Jews are surprised, the evangelist

adds the clarification, "He was speaking of the temple of his body. So when Jesus rose from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this and believed the scripture and the word which Jesus had said." /9

In the form in which they are given to us, these two sayings are to be attributed to the community. /10 Here yet again we find a reflection of the theme of meditation raised earlier. A clarification, splendid for the understanding of the text is presented - the contrast between the risen body and the temple made with hands. We may note that Paul speaks only once in reference to the glorious body of the risen One (Phil 3.21). Again, as in 1 Cor 15, he does this to show that it is a heavenly body and quite different from our earthly body. This contrast between what is human and what is divine is to be found constantly where the resurrection is mentioned. As a result, it can be said that the body of Christ is not so much the person of Jesus of Nazareth raised to the right hand of God as a cosmic reality which can be described either as a body or as a temple. Moreover, according to 1 Cor 15,20, the resurrection, already effected, anticipates the eschatological reality. This resurrection is already showing its results in the life of those who are linked to Christ. Thus, such a reality is not only future but is already present. This explains the paradoxical fact that the phrase "body of Christ" never denotes his dead body, but very often the community of believers! The body of Christ is an eschatological dimension but a dimension already realized. It is a cosmic reality. Every man is called to share in it by faith and by baptism. It is this that explains why Paul can say successively that the church is the body of Christ (1 Cor 12.27) and the temple of God (1 Cor 3.16). A passage in the epistle to the Hebrews (10.19) explains the identification in this way: "Therefore, brethren, since we have confidence to enter the sanctuary by the blood of Jesus, by the new and living way which he opened for us through the veil - that is to say, his flesh - and since we have a great high priest over the house of God, let us draw near....". The living way which opens up for us access to the heavenly temple stands for the resurrection, understood as the elevation of Christ to God's side. The reality of death is indicated by the word "flesh" here synonymous with "body". The word "house" denotes both



the temple and the new Israel i.e., the Church. /11 Access to God is open for us henceforth by the resurrection, and that in the life of the Church, as the rest of the passage shows. Paul, the epistle to the Hebrews, the epistle of Peter (1 Pet 2.4-6), the texts quoted from Mark and John agree in affirming that, through the resurrection, the Christian community, as the locus of the presence of God, /12, takes over from the temple. The affinities between Mark 14.58 and 2 Cor 5.1, stem from a group of reflections on the resurrection, the temple and the community, common to those Christians whose thought is known to us from the NT. /13

### The Tabernacle

It remains for us now to explain the enigmatic term skēnos, an important word since Paul returns to it on two occasions in what follows. We have to remind ourselves first that, for Paul, it is not only the community which is the receptacle of the Holy Spirit but each believer individually. Christ who lives in the Church, his body, also lives in each of the members of the body: "Your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit." (1 Cor 6.19). In Col 2.11 he says the same thing in a different way, "You were circumcised with a circumcision made without hands, by putting off the body of flesh in the circumcision of Christ .....you were also raised with him." /14 In Rom 8.10 he also writes, "If Christ is in you, although the body should be dead...." /15 These texts are peculiar in that they speak of the body from two opposite, yet related, points of view. On the one hand, the body is given over to death and must be stripped off; on the other hand, it is the seat of the life of Christ or the temple of the Holy Spirit. Paul expressed this also in 4.16 where he speaks of the outer man perishing and the inner man being renewed day by day. /16 We have to conclude, then, that the word skēnos, with its reminder of the temple, is used by Paul of the presence of Christ in us in the verse.

It need not be awkward that the tabernacle and not the temple is involved. Both, individually, were signs of the presence of God among his people. Revelation refers to two texts which seem to us to have had more importance for the thought of the first Christians than would appear at

first sight (Rev. 21.3). They speak of the moment in the heavenly Jerusalem when God will be with men: "Sing and rejoice, daughter of Zion, for I am coming and I will make my dwelling among you (kataskēnoō) (Zech 2.14) and "I will establish my sanctuary among them for ever and my dwelling (kataskēnōsis) will be among them" (Ezek. 37.26). /17  
The expectation of this eschatological reality, noted in the case of the temple, is also present in the Johannine prologue in the case of the tabernacle: "The Word made his dwelling among us" (eskēnōsen)."

In the story of the Annunciation (Lk 1.35) the angel said to Mary that the power of God would overshadow her (episkiazō). The verb comes from Exodus 40.35 (LXX) in reference to the tabernacle and its use shows that a link is made between Christ and the tabernacle. In Acts 15.16 the prophecy of Amos is quoted (9.11), "I will build again the tabernacle of David (anoikodomēsō tēn skēnēn) which has fallen.... I will set it up again that the remnant of men may seek the Lord." This fallen tabernacle which God raises clearly means, for the author of Acts, Christ dead and risen. "Kurios", as always in the NT, denotes Christ and the "remnant" speaks of the moment when, through the resurrection, the Gentiles will come to Christ and make their entrance into the Church. In John 7 Jesus reveals himself to the crowd at the Feast of Tabernacles and the gift of living water recalls the miracle of the rock in the desert and the river flowing out from the temple of Ezekial. The story of the Transfiguration, in its mention of the three tabernacles, shows traces of a coming together of Moses, the tabernacle and Christ.

Are we to conclude from this that the term "tou skēnous" must be understood quite simply as a synonym of the inner man of 2 Cor 4.16? This would lead us to view the genitive as a real genitive. It must be noted, of course, that Paul shows himself taken up with the contrast between the frail appearance of his wretched body and the treasure it carries. This treasure does not only stand for the gospel, but the life of the Risen One in it (4.10). This life is carried in a vessel of clay. The onlooker, on the outside, can only see the outer man who bears the marks of his coming destruction. But the apostle looks to the unseen, i.e., the future and already present work of God and he knows that his inner man - mysterious but real - is being renewed.

The following verses, however, show that this explanation is not enough. Indeed the figure changes for Paul writes immediately afterwards, "in this tent" (vss2,4). For the Jew who has attended the feast of tabernacles, the tent is not only the sign of God's presence but the summons to travel on into the wilderness. So Paul in these chapters speaks of his apostolate, his struggle and his weariness. To be in the tent is to be under the sign of the Risen One - we would have to say even under the power of death and resurrection - but at the same time, in the daily struggle of the earthly life. The heavenly temple alone, indestructible as it is, will provide the traveller with his stable and definitive dwelling. In the allusive, succinct style of the passage, the genitive is neither a real genitive nor altogether an expegetic genitive. The "skēnos" is not simply the casing of the earthly house nor is it to be confused with it. It is the person already renewed seen from a new angle. Hence we translate the genitive by an apposition followed by an exclamation mark. The genitive distinguishes and unites all at once. Paul, with this simple word, begins a fresh way of conveying the meaning of his present life: by the sign of the presence of the risen One and yet of incompleteness!

The neuter "skēnos" instead of the expected feminine has its explanation, in our view, in the influence of the verb "skēnoō" and the substantives derived from it (skēnōsis, skēnōma) and further in the ambiguous but assured link made by Paul between the body and the tabernacle, requiring a neuter rather than a feminine. /18

---

Such an explanation casts light on the exegesis of the following verses and gains, in return, an important confirmation, "... Here indeed we groan and long to put on our heavenly dwelling (v2), so that by putting it on, we may not be found naked (v3). For while we are still in this tent, we sigh with anxiety; not that we would be unclothed, but that we would be further clothed, so that what is mortal may be swallowed up by life (v4). He who prepared us for this very thing is God, who has given us the Spirit as a guarantee (v5). So we are always of good courage; we know that while we are at home in the body we are away from the Lord (v6), for we walk by faith, not by sight (v7). We



are of good courage, and we would rather be away from the body and at home with the Lord (v8). So whether we are at home or away, we make it our aim to please him (v9). For we must all appear before the judgment seat, so that each one may receive good or evil, according to what he has done in the body." (v11)

In these verses, the ideas intersect and entwine in a complex way. The fear of judgment is linked by Paul with the expectation of the heavenly dwelling. But before taking up this point, we may note a change in metaphor. In v2, at the very start, Paul joins together the thought of clothing with that of dwelling in the formula "to be clothed with a heavenly home." Later, he distinguishes them. In vss 2 to 5, the main theme is expressed by the verb duō and its compounds; in vss 6 to 8, on the other hand, it is expressed by the verb dēmō, with the coupling in vss 6, 8, and 9 of endēmō-ekdēmō alternating.

We will begin with the latter metaphor, altering the order of the verses slightly for clarity of expression.

### The believer will leave his heavenly home

In the vss 6 ("...at home in the body we are away from the Lord") and 8 ("we would rather be away from the body and at home with the Lord"), Paul asserts, in a way that leaves no room for discussion, that to be completely with the Lord, he will have to leave the body. This shows that the body, as we have noticed above, is not, in the thought of the apostle, a kind of substance guaranteeing the permanence of the person. Here we have an echo of the verb "destroyed" (kataluthē) of v1. The earthly body is not required to submit to any modification but will be destroyed and then abandoned. When Paul writes in 1 Cor 15.37, "What you sow does not come to life unless it dies.....And what you sow is not the body which is to be, but a bare kernel", he underlines rightly that there is a hiatus between the former reality and that which is new. An act of God is required which is nothing less than a new creation whatever its appearance; this is what the verb "Zōopoiein" shows. The bare kernel is not some substance that will continue but the former body which is disappearing. And if Paul continues, "God will give it a body..",

we should see in the "it" not so much the grain as the person whose identity is stated without being explained.

As in Phil 1.23-24 Paul expresses here the expectation of an immediate communion with Christ after death. It is obvious that this hope fits awkwardly into the cosmic conception of the resurrection such as we find in 1 Cor 15.20ff and 1 Thess 4.13ff. According to these texts it is only after the parousia that the believers will receive their glorious body. This inconsistency can already be seen in the OT and Judaism. /19 Faith in the resurrection, far from dissipating it, accentuates it. The man who considers that the eschatological times have already begun and that the power of the resurrection has already broken in within the life of the believer, can neither abandon the parousia as a cosmic drama nor conceive of a new intermediate period intervening between the death and the return of Christ, for "nothing can separate us... from Christ." Speculation on the way in which these events will take place is, however, very relative. Everything is seen from the central reality already taken place. This gives the eschatology a character more existential than descriptive.

But the resurrection, however decisive it may be, should not be taken for the parousia. Paul knows that as long as he sojourns in the mortal body, he is far from the Lord. That is why, in spite of the event that has taken place, his journey still resembles that of Abraham who heeded God and gave him obedience in his venture of faith. "We walk by faith and not by sight." (v7) This verse should be set alongside that of 1 Cor. 13.12, "Now we see in a mirror dimly" and that of Rom. 8. 24,25, "We hope for what we do not see" (blepomen) This parallel shows that the passage which comes just before ours (2 Cor.4.18), is to be understood from a temporal and not hellenistic perspective: "We look to the things that are (still) unseen (mē blepomenona).". The epistle to the Hebrews says much the same in its definition of faith, "the conviction of things which (can) not (yet) be seen." (11.1) Indeed, throughout chapter 11, the writer shows that the witnesses of the old Covenant looked beyond their earthly horizon without yet seeing the object of their expectation (11. 13,26,27). They were strangers and pilgrims, on the way to the true homeland. Christians had the privilege of being able to

"look to Jesus" (12.2) but they too are travellers as much as the others (1 Pet.2.11). The verb "peripateō" which, for want of a better word, we have translated "walk", shows that Paul draws a parallel between his life of wandering as apostle and that of Abraham who, according to Hebrews, lived in a tent and that of the Hebrew people, also in the wilderness. Their onward walk is like a parable of the Christian's pilgrimage to the heavenly country. This is one of the reasons indeed why the epistle to the Hebrews deals with it as such length. In 1 Cor. 10.1-10 Paul again shows that the Christian's situation remains, in many respects, like that of the Israelites in the desert.

### The metaphor of clothing

In vss 6 to 9, Paul, in seeing his situation under the concept of the body as an earthly house which must be abandoned, underlined the distance which still separates him from the Lord. In vss 2 to 5, on the other hand, he uses the metaphor of clothing to give an account of the event which has already taken place in his life as a Christian. Three aorist participles occur in turn: reclothed (v3), God having prepared us; God having given us the Spirit as a guarantee (v5).

These three verbs express, in a different way, the same thing. We will begin by examining the last two. "Katargasamenos" expresses the action of God who brings in the power of the resurrection to the life of the believer. If Paul proceeds to recall the gift of the Spirit as guarantee, he does it to show that now already this gift is something of the eschatological reality. We have to do here with a real anticipation of what will be fully achieved, given fully at the moment of the parousia.

What then does the verb "clothed" mean? Has it to do with the expression of the bodily state? /20 Paul would then be concerned about not losing the actual body that clothes him but putting on over it the glorified body. Such a concern would be in flagrant contradiction with the expectation expressed in vss 6 to 9. But it must be noted also that the metaphor of clothing does not suit the body of flesh as such. Doubtless in a text like Job 10.11 where he speaks of the creation of man, we are told that God clothed him with skin and flesh - a meditation on Genesis 2.17.



It would be a mistake to conclude from this that a distinction should be drawn between the true substance of man and the body that clothes him. In contrast with this unique text in Job - to which indeed that very Hellenized text of Wisdom is to be added - there is a whole series, LXX and NT, where the verb "duō" and its compounds have as their complement a moral or religious term. God or man is clothed with might (Isaiah 52.1), with power (Ps. 93.1), with righteousness (Ps. 132.9) etc.. In the NT we have "clothed" with the armour of God (Eph. 6.14), the arms of light (1 Thess. 5.8), the power of God (Luke 24.49) and especially the new man (Col. 3.10) and Christ himself (Gal 3.27 and Rom. 13.14). The last two expressions have a quite special importance for the understanding of the text. We have here exactly the thought expressed by the two participles, "having prepared", "having given", of v5, mentioned at the start of the section - the eschatological reality already present. The metaphor of clothing comes from the thought of a given righteousness, as in the vision of Zechariah 3.4 where the high priest is clothed with sumptuous robes. /21

The compound verb - a very rare term - "ependuō" is to be given its full meaning. The believer will not put on his glorious body over the earthly body (since this will be destroyed). In this case, a term which might have sufficed would have been "allagēnai" (transform). He puts it on over the new being, the inner being and, of course, without suppressing it. /22 This transformation will, then, no longer be merely an invisible reality of the order of faith but a reality substantially achieved. And this will coincide, according to the end of v4, with the destruction of the mortal body, "that what is mortal may be 'swallowed up' (katapothē) by life", according to Isaiah 25.8. /23

If this body, insofar as it is mortal and insofar as it separates the believer from his Lord - according to v6 to v9 - corresponds to the earthly house of v1, such a body insofar as it is already under the sign of the presence of Christ and of the influence of the Spirit, corresponds to the tabernacle to which Paul makes an all-too-fleeting reference in the first verse.

### The Pauline Mystique

It is our intention further to expound the other

teaching given in this passage not only to complete the exegesis of the passage but to show all the implications of the terms "en tō skēnei" (in the tent).

"And here indeed we groan, and long to put on our heavenly dwelling. For, while we are still in this tent, we sigh with anxiety....." (v2 and v4). What we have here is not the groan of flesh being murdered, but, as in Romans 8.23,26 the sigh of the Spirit. Because the Spirit is the "arrabōn" (earnest, guarantee), tasting of the heavenly reality, he stirs up a fervent desire for total fulfilment. The participle "baroumenoi" (lit. "burdened") should then be understood from the substantive "baros" ("weight of glory") mentioned by Paul just before (4.17). If Paul says "in this tent" ("here") and not "in the body" or "in the house", he does so because the term suggests the reality already given and the onward march, the journey of the apostle by faith. In this ambiguous situation in the life of the believer, he already sees in advance the world sighing for its glorious transformation (Rom.8.22). He feels within himself the groanings (like those of a woman in travail) of the Spirit. Thus the position of the Christian, contained in the words "en tō skēnei" (in the tent), is characterized by an intense straining after the glorious future. It is a mystique of hope.

But in addition to this straining after fulfilment, we have something else, closely bound up with the first, driving him to action. This does not surprise us from one who wrote Philippians 3.12, "I press on to make it my own because Christ Jesus has made me his own." The call of the apostle which is one and the same with the appearance of the risen Christ on the road to Damascus, was both the illumination anticipating the glorious vision and the command given to preach the gospel, and, in particular, to Gentiles (Gal.1.12,15,16). Paul is aware that a task has been entrusted to him. He is responsible for it and will have to render an account (1 Cor.9.17). Thus the Damascus event became the source of mystical power, of hope and, at the same time, of action and witness. Shortly before our text, Paul, in speaking of his apostolate, unites the power of the resurrection with faith, and faith with the word it is commissioned to utter (4.11,16). The expectation of heavenly happiness does not deflect him from

his present responsibility. If he is tempted for a moment to forget his task, he quickly takes it up again. (Phil 1.24). Whether the uncertainty of the present situation continues or comes to an end by a premature death, the essential thing remains, he declares, "to please the Lord." (v9). For there is no heavenly life without judgement. /24 "We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ...." (v10). In this judgement it is not a matter, properly speaking, of salvation or damnation, but a kind of sifting like that of 1 Cor.3. 13-15. The proof will then be given as to what has been acceptable in this life and what has not. Every piece of valuable material will survive and the one responsible will get his reward; what is counterfeit will, on the other hand, be destroyed. V10 is to be understood as an unveiling of what is still hidden and of a test which, when it is completed, will be a matter not so much of salvation or damnation but of reward or shame.

In v3 we believe Paul is already expressing this fear of judgement. /25 In successive strokes, first obscure, then clear, Paul, in vss 3-4 and 9-10, speaks of the self-searching evoked by the prospect of judgement and the responsibility deriving from it. All this is already contained in the simple expression, "in the tent". Salvation is viewed as an onward march under the eye of the master and a concern to make known the message received. Grace could not set the man who receives it in an easy complacency like that of a man of property who considers he is free from all risk. Eschatology is also a threat. Paul reminds the Corinthians of this on many occasions - something they were all too inclined to forget (1 Cor.3.13; 4.5,10; 6.10; 10.1-13 etc) - and he himself is in the front of those who live in a productive uneasiness.

"So that by putting it on we may not be found naked." (v3) The verb "to be found" is sometimes used as a synonym almost for the simple "to be" but it does suggest, however, the look of someone else directed to one's self. Here it is, of course, the look of God. We have an illuminating parallel in Phil 3.9-12, "For his sake I have suffered the loss of all things.....that I may gain Christ (7,8) and be found in him, not having a righteousness of my own based on Law but that which is through faith in Christ.... the righteousness from God that depends on faith (v9) that I may



know him and the power of his resurrection, and may share his sufferings, becoming like him in his death (v10) that if possible I may attain the resurrection from the dead,"

/26 Paul has no longer any need to earn his salvation since the righteousness of God is conferred by sheer grace. The concern to "win Christ", however, remains one of the essential elements of his thought. On the day of judgement he wants to be found by God, arrayed in the robe of righteousness. /27 This righteousness is only real as it compels one to action. It is only then the presence of the triumphant Christ and not a soporific illusion. /28 In 1 Cor.9 where Paul speaks of his ministry, he ends his discussion with these words, "I pommel my body and subdue it, lest after preaching to others I myself should be disqualified." (v27)

The conjunction ei (if) and its copulae ge kai (v3) introduce a conditional phrase which can be put in this paraphrase, "But let us not forget that the attempt will not be successful unless, on the day of judgement, God indeed finds us clothed with his righteousness." /29 The adjective "naked" (gumnos) in this case has only a privative sense, "without the clothing of righteousness". It does however have the notion of shame associated for every Jew with the state of nudity. /30

Finally, when Paul writes in v4, "For while we are in this tent, we sigh with anxiety; not that we would be unclothed, but that we would be further clothed", we have to give the verb "would" a very strong meaning. Paul has reproached the Corinthians with a facile complacency, and has placed his own action over against their fallacious "gnostic" assurance. The true mystic is one who exerts his will. Any other mystic is not in Christ and can only end with the loss of salvation. This is what Paul wants to avoid. "I press on to win Christ." (Cf. Phil 3.12) /31

Paul does not develop his thought by methodically linking together a succession of somewhat fixed concepts. He does not express himself like a thinker disclosing his teaching after having methodically distinguished all its elements. Rather the apostle gives an account of the discovery he has made, of the situation in which it placed him and placed the world. This he does in a swift and unexpected way, using words and images derived mainly from

the OT. He relies on a series of reflective themes, common to the early Christians and makes rapid allusions to them. Words are signs used to remind the reader of an impression or argument. /32 He can juggle with words in a way that surprises us but which was clear to the first readers who grasped quickly each suggestion.

The unity of these verses and, at the same time, their significance are given to us in a way which eludes the hasty reader and which is not understood by the careful reader if he ignores how evocative they were for a Jew. The word "skēnos" recalls the period in the wilderness and the feast of tabernacles. All of this is transposed by the Christian but is none the less important. We have to do here with the presence of Christ and at the same time with the distance which still separates the traveller from the heavenly temple. It is an onward march in peril and hope.

Thus understood, the passage fits in perfectly in the total context of chapters 1 to 7 of the epistle. If Paul sees himself already in the triumphal chariot of the conquering Christ (2.14), it is too in the weakness of the crucified. In the intermediate period in which we are placed, strength and weakness, resurrection and death are inseparable. It is especially in the two epistles to the Corinthians that Paul attacks the false assurance of those who believe they are already in glory. The believers are still on the way. They must fight with courage. /33 They remain under the gaze and judgment of God, The believer is only truly "en Christō" only if he knows himself to be "en tō skēnei".

## Notes

1. This article first appeared in Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses N.4, 1961 as "Le tabernacle et la vie en Christ"; Exegese de 2 Corinthiens 5.1 to 10; it is here produced by kind permission of Pastor Guy Wagner, Pastor of L'Église réformée de France, and a member of the distinguished panel of translators responsible for the French Ecumenical Version of the Bible; English translation is by the Editor of IBS.

. TWNT, V, p149, L.24

. See Lev. 26.1,30; Isaiah 2.13;10.11;16.12;17.8;19.1;21.9; 30.7;46.6 etc; see also Acts 17.24.

. These words are quoted from Ps.132.5. Several mss have corrected "oiko" to "Theo" to harmonize with the LXX. The word "oikos" sums up a speculation to which we will return.

. Philo, Vita Mosis, II, 71-74. On the Rabbis, see Héring, Ep. aux Hébreux, Comm.NT., XII, p77, N.1, and G. Schrenk, art. "Ieron", in TWNT, III, p239-40.

. See O. Cullman, L'opposition contre le temple de Jérusalem. Motif commun de la théologie johannique et du monde ambiant, NTS, Vol 5, April 1959, p157

. The event radicalizes thus the dualism which is not only temporal but spatial or, better, ontological. The present "we have" shows that the dwelling is now ready in the eternity of God.

See also Matt. 22. 23-32

. The early Christians searched everywhere in the OT for prophecies of the resurrection. They found them in passages which surprise us such as Ps.2 and 110; Hosea 6.3; Amos 9.11 (see Acts 15.4). In 2 Kings 20.5 we have a text to which not enough attention has been given since it is nowhere quoted. Hezekiah healed - and in a way as the following song has it - raised, "climbs on the third day to the temple" For the way in which the early Christians understood the resurrection and the evidence they found in the Scriptures of the resurrection, cf our work, La resurrection de Jésus-Christ et la formation de la christologie; thesis, Paris 1960

0. Cf. the commentary on these two words in Père Congar's book, Le mystère du temple (Lectio divina, 22). His exposition would have been more complete if he had put (or been able to put?) these words in their right place, at the same time as the statements in the epistles.

1. The identification has been prepared for by the twofold meaning of the word "oikos" (in Hebrew baït),



the temple and house of Israel. It is interesting to note that the Rule of Discipline of Qumran (8.5-6 and 9.5-6) describes the community in these words: "house of holiness for Aaron". Cf for the comparison "Church-Temple", O Michel, TWNT, IV, p890ff and V, p122 to 155 and Y.M.J. Congar, op.cit., p181ff

12. See also John 4. 21-24
13. The verb kataluō is used for the destruction of the temple (Mk 14.58; 13.12; 15.29 and Acts 6.14), for the destruction of the Church (Rom. 14. 19-20, cf also Acts 5.38),
14. It is interesting to note that cheiropoiētos, like kataluō, is used of the law (here under the aspect of circumcision. The Jewish Temple, circumcision and the prejudices from which Paul has been set free (Gal 2.18) are human works which the death of Jesus has destroyed.
15. Cf also Col 1.27
16. It is not a matter, properly speaking, of two substances but of two different determinations of being, of two different ways of looking at it. Substantialist terminology is not explained merely by hellenistic contamination, but quite simply by the common language which expresses being in terms of things, which spontaneously materializes.
17. The importance of Zechariah for the elaboration of the account of the entry into Jerusalem and the Passion is well-known; cf the allusions to Ezekial in Heb 13.20 and 2 Cor 6.16.
18. The text of Wisdom 9.15 (the perishable body weighs upon the soul and the tent (skēnos) of clay makes the spirit heavy) shows that the term was used in Alexandrian Judaism. There is, of course, no allusion to the tabernacle here. But it could not be concluded that an allusion is not to be found in the odd genitive of Paul. Paul's reasoning is, however, totally different from that of Philo.
19. According as hope is viewed from a cosmic or individual point of view, eschatology is described as an overthrow

- of the entire world (Dan 7 to 12; Isaiah 26 and 60 etc) , or as immediate union with God after death (Ps 73.4; Job 19.26 etc). So it is misleading to explain (with H. Windisch, M. Goguel etc) this incoherence by hellenistic influence.
0. For this interpretation cf J. Héring's commentary on 2 Corinthians (Delachaux and Nestlé).
  1. Ancient commentators without exception have interpreted the term in a moral or spiritual sense: "If we have not been stripped of faith or works." (Theodoret, Ambrosiaster, Pelagius etc). "The faithful who appear before the presence of God, clothed with Christ and adorned with his righteousness, receive the glorious garment of immortality." (Calvin). Cf also some modern commentators: "If we have put on Christ in this life" (K von Hoffmann, A Schlatter). G. Schrenk (TWNT I, p558) also says that God will examine the reality of the spiritual life of the Christian.
  2. Allo is right to comment that every explanation which does not take into account, or sufficiently into account, the prefix of this very rare composite verb should be avoided. Commentary on 2 Cor., p123.
  3. The same quotation is found in 1 Cor 15.55. Paul at this point writes, "For this perishable nature must put on the imperishable, and this mortal nature must put on immortality." This does not mean that the glorious body will be placed on top of the actual body, but, in the logic of the whole chapter, what is actually under the sign of the first Adam (earthly) will be transformed into the image of the new Adam. It will be noticed that the verb "to clothe" has two abstract words as object, imperishability and immortality.
  4. The perspective of the final judgment does not fit very well the level of objective description of the unfolding of the eschatological events. It has none the less an absolutely primordial importance for the thought and life of the apostle. The originality of the Pauline mystique is precisely the inclusion of this juridical aspect. It is not necessary so much to speak of a juxtaposition of two lines in his thought, mystical and juridical, as to

describe Paul's position 'sui generis' before God and the world, the result of his initial discovery in the resurrection. In the passage, it is clear that everything depends on the phrase en tō skēnei, not unlike an en Christō!

25. A. Oepke (TWNT, I, p773-775 and II, p318-321) recognizes that Paul is speaking of judgment from v3 onward, but thinks that Paul is afraid of being treated as someone condemned, i.e., to remain for ever without his body as a result of God's verdict. The endusamenoi for him only takes up the ependusasthai of v2.
26. Righteousness, then, comes from heaven, like the new Adam (1 Cor 15.48), like the house of v1 of this passage. But as it manifests itself in this aeon, in this mortal body, it cannot yet be taken hold of except by faith. It still leads us on the road to the promised land, with Christ, but in a tent!
27. The parallels to this eurethē are Dan 6.22 (LXX); Matt 24.46; Gal 2.17; 1 Peter 1.7 and Rev 20.15 in addition to Phil 3.10.
28. R. Reitzenstein (Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, 3rd ed., p354ff), in comparing this passage with Hermetic texts, perceived rightly that the inward man was confused with the new reality which the believer put on as a garment. But he did not indicate that it is not Paul but rather gnosis which thinks of a substance guaranteeing magically salvation.
29. It is well-known how many difficulties this conjunction has presented to grammarians and exegetes who did not recognize that we have to do with judgement in this verse. Allo rightly said that all the grammarians did was to follow the exegetes in their uncertainties! The only passage where we find an ei ge kai is Gal 3.4, "Did you experience so many things in vain?-if it really is in vain!" The phrase has the same meaning as in our passage, "Your discovery of grace has been for nothing. Take care! At the judgment, it will not be "for nothing" but for your shame!"
30. It is not surprising that those who wish to see in this



gumnos an incorporeal state (likewise Oepke), only find parallels in Greek philosophers! The true parallels are symmetrical with those indicated for the duō. Cf especially Matt 22.12, Rev 16.15 and 19.18

31. R. Bultmann (Théologie du NT., p198) sees in this "we do not wish to be stripped" a polemic against the viewpoint of Gnostic Corinthian opponents. They would have wanted a beyond which was not corporeal. This is a wrong interpretation of Paul in v9 if here his preoccupation had been to prove the corporeal character of the future life. If there is a polemic thrust in this verse, it is directed against the composure of the Corinthians for whom salvation is a thing acquired and not life "in a tent" !

32. Bultmann considers that the language of Paul is often inadequate because he expresses existential truths in an objective language. But he does not see that Paul, without having thought out methodically the problems of language, is conscious of this inadequacy. It appears to us certain that Paul knew, at least intuitively, that a language is a language. That is surely why he plays about so freely with words and expressions. Bultmann, the victim of his conceptual rigour, finds difficulty in understanding this play. This may be seen, for example, in his commentary (KEK, Meyer 1976, 2 Cor. p135) where he is attracted by Reitzenstein's explanation (see N.28 above) but he dismisses it peremptorily with this mere affirmation: "Inward man cannot be understood as a garment." This is true for the logic of Bultmann but not for Paul's language, since, in his view, a man can be clothed with Christ or the new man (Gal 3.27 and Col 3.10)

33. The oun of v6 takes up the fundamental leitmotif (4.1,16).

John Gray: The Biblical Doctrine of God,

T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1979 pp. xiii+401

The title of this book may at first appear to imply that it is devoted to the study of a NT concept, and so it is, but it is much more than that. The author, who has made such important contributions to the study of the Jgaritic texts and who has now retired from the chair of Hebrew and Semitic Languages at Aberdeen, argues that the theme of the Reign of God, which is central to the faith of ancient Israel as well as to the Gospel, has its roots in an ancient mythology. As the process of demythologization, which is necessary for the appreciation of the message of the bible in its relevance to our modern situation, may lead to the substitution of an even stronger modern theological idiom, the author suggests that it is "simpler to induct ourselves into the ancient idiom by an explanation of what the Reign of God and its related ideas actually signified to those to whom it was an article of living faith at various periods."

Starting with an extended discussion of the history of the thesis that the religious cult of ancient Israel had an annual celebration of the Kingship of Yahweh which is reflected especially in the Enthronement Psalms, and continuing with a study of the theme of the Reign of God in the Psalms (this constitutes the longest chapter in the book), the prophets, apocalyptic and the NT, the author moves steadily towards his objective of understanding "the full implications of the Reign of God and related ideas in the mission of Jesus in His own meaningful idiom." The result is a solid work of scholarship which can be recommended to the readers of this journal, though few will want to devour it at one sitting or, as the author might say, sederunt.

Queen's University,  
Belfast

D.R.G. Beattie

A.R. Millard and D.J. Wiseman (eds), Essays on the Patriarchal Narratives  
IVPress 1980 pp223 £6.95

This collection of seven essays represents the first fruits of a project being undertaken under the auspices of Tyndale House, Cambridge. The writers are all evangelical scholars (lecturers and researchers), who have thus re-entered the well-known theological battle-ground of the book of Genesis. There are, naturally, apologetic interests and arguments, but it is refreshing to find a major evangelical handling of Genesis which is prepared to break new ground and to break away from the arid debates of earlier eras. The question of authorship is scarcely raised, nor do "J", "E" and "P" come in for sneers or angry attacks; indeed one or two of the writers even show a cautious measure of willingness to work within these symbols. The catalyst which has resulted in this symposium is to a large extent the two important books on the patriarchal narratives by T.L. Thompson (The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives, 1974) and

J. van Seters (Abraham in History and Tradition, 1975). Hence historicity, dating, and the relevance of archaeological data are the topics of major interest; but while the arguments and conclusions of Thompson and van Seters are challenged and criticized, there is no sustained or unfair polemic, and the total thrust of the book is more positive than negative. The least positive is A.R. Millard's essay which seeks above all to rebut the familiar charge that there are anachronisms in Genesis, but even here there are new insights into the nature of ancient Near Eastern texts.

The general strength of the contributions is the essayists' knowledge of various aspects of ancient Near Eastern data. This is true of D.J. Wiseman's fresh study of Abraham (presenting the interesting hypothesis that Abraham's role in Canaan was that of a local governor rather than a nomad chief); but it is especially true of the contributions by J.J. Bimson and M.J. Selman. Bimson offers a detailed reappraisal of the archaeological data pertinent to the dating of the patriarchal period, and Selman reconsiders the data relating to the social customs of the patriarchs; both essays will be useful compendia of data, whether or not the reader is inclined to accept the conclusions reached. (The main conclusions can be briefly stated: Bimson argues that Abraham best fits a Middle Bronze I setting, Jacob a Middle Bronze II, and that therefore the patriarchal era must have been the transitional centuries; Selman, while firmly eliminating doubtful and invalid comparisons from consideration, still finds a considerable core of material to suggest that the patriarchs and their stories belong precisely to the setting given them in Genesis - the first half of the second millennium BC).

It is good to see the lack of dogmatism and the cautious approach which characterize the book. The result is however much more open-ended than is often the case with evangelical publications. Goldingay's interesting analysis of the biblical presentation of the patriarchs, which he finds remarkable homogeneous (centring round the theme of "blessing"), may on the one hand tend to combat the fragmentary hypotheses which bid fair to become dominant in current pentateuchal criticism; but his recognition that the whole of Genesis - Kings "belongs" in some sense to the Exile undoubtedly invites the view (though he does not accept it) that the whole Pentateuch was composed no earlier. Similarly, Bimson's frank admission that the archaeology of Hebron is a problem for his reconstruction can only weaken his whole case. At times too much would seem to be "proven" - not least when Bimson uses the archaeological data (Hebron excepted!) to support the life-spans attributed to the patriarchs in Genesis. Few non-evangelical scholars will find his general comments about longevity very convincing.

It is good to find some of the essays devoted mainly to biblical exegesis. Goldingay's is one; and another is the contribution of G.J. Wenham, which takes a fresh look at the vexed question of the religion of the patriarchs. While he assesses critically the hypotheses of Alt, Cross and Westermann, he gives proportionately more attention to careful and thorough analysis of the biblical data.

His arguments about the meaning of Exodus 6.3 are particularly valuable - not least to evangelical readers, who have all too often sought to evade the plain surface sense of the verse. His conclusions about patriarchal



religion deserve careful attention, whether or not the by-products of his arguments (that the relevant parts of Genesis are probably early and accurate) are accepted or not.

Undoubtedly those hostile to evangelicals will find familiar flaws (such as occasional circularity of argument, and the general suspicion that the conclusion is all too often the hidden presupposition); but one hopes that the generally irenic and cautious tone of the book will meet a response in kind. Be that as it may, these essays make a genuine contribution to a subject of lively current interest; and one looks forward to future publications arising from the Tyndale House project.

The Queen's University  
of Belfast

D.F. Payne

Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman, Hosea. A New Translation with Commentary, Anchor Bible 24, Doubleday, New York 1980 pp xviii + 701 \$14 11 illus.

This, the first of five volumes on the twelve prophets, will be followed by one on Micah and Amos. After over a hundred pages of introduction (historical background; Hosea the prophet; Hosea as literature; bibliography) comes the commentary itself. It covers 1-3 (Hosea's marriage) and 4-14 (his prophecies). Extensive indices close the book. Since this is the first major commentary to appear in English since the 1974 translation of Wolff's important work (1965), it deserves a lengthy review.

According to A. and F., the book is an anthology of narrative and oracles compiled by "faithful conservators of the tradition of inspired messengers of the eighth century" (p53), which reached its final form during the Babylonian exile. Only one prophet is involved, namely Hosea. The authors provide a list of 76 major repetitions and correspondences to show this. Chapters 1-2 are bibliographical; ch.3 is an autobiographical appendix and 4-14, a collection of utterances. As to date, the authors' stand is diametrically opposite to Wolff's view: "in spite of the stout attempts of scholars, it is practically impossible to date or place any of Hosea's oracles with certainty; and rather than guess, or worse, force the passage into some selected historical occasion that we happen to know a little about, we have tried to manage without this aid, even though most of the time we are left groping" (p73).

In general, the authors' approach to the text is conservative in the sense that they prefer to understand the extant Hebrew and not emend. To explain many of the difficulties they appeal to the Northwest Semitic grammar or Hebrew in the wider context of Ugaritic, Phoenician etc., (p67) without going to the extreme of writing a Ugaritic commentary on Hosea. Here I would see a failing since they appear to be creaming off the grammatical insights provided by studying such texts and yet do not explore possible parallels between Hosea and extra-biblical literature.

Because they are prepared to go beyond the bounds of conventional grammars A. and F. can explain 8.13 "sacrifices of my loved ones", as a

reference to child sacrifice (p510) and such examples could be multiplied (e.g. the reference to Tiphel, p579). Yet, by ignoring a passage from Ugaritic, they fail to see the imagery in 13.3 ("they will be like morning mist/dew/chaff/smoke"). Evidently it alludes to Israel vanishing like the very smoke of their sacrifices just as when Aqhat was killed "His breath came out like a wind, his life like spittle, like smoke from his nose." Note, too, the Babylonian incantation which addresses Fire: "Scatter like fog; rise like dew; like smoke ascend to the heaven of Anu", using similes identical with Hosea's. Since "the text of Hosea competes with Job for the distinction of containing more unintelligible passages than any other book of the Hebrew Bible" (p66), A. and F. make no claim to have solved every crux. One of the strengths of the commentary, though, is the amount of data it provides in discussing knotty passages. There is no doubt that great care has been taken; yet some translations could be improved on. Examples are "they make reverence to the heifers" (10.5), not "about the heifers....they are excited"; "I will love them more than a free-will offering" (14.5 cf.6.6); and not included in the list of eleven possible versions for 4.4 (pp347f) is "and how bitter is my dispute with you, O priest", surely a pun on komer "(pagan) priest" and ki-mar, "how bitter".

A. and F. are very much aware that Hosea is poetry. They sensibly break up the text into stanzas, each with its heading, which helps the reader considerably. Each section is prefaced by a discussion of poetic (overall) structure and throughout, poetic devices are noted. These include abstract for concrete, the broken construct chain (6.9; 14.3); chiasmus and chiasmic passages; the discontinuous bicolon and tetracolon; envelope figure; hendiadys; keywords; merismus; ordered lists; pseudo-sorites (2.14-15; 8.7; 9.11-16) and reversed similes (following Wolff). Unnoticed goes gender parallelism in 2.23; 5.1; 6.6; 7.1; 11.4; 13.3 and 14.6. The authors make the suggestion that Hosea is not written as straightforward poetry; there are too many prose elements in chs 1-3 and too much variation within 4-14. They conclude that "the material is not classical poetry" nor is it even elevated prose. Instead "for the most part Hosea goes off on his own bent, a kind of free verse, or unregulated rhythmic pattern" (p65). Until we know much more about Hebrew poetry, their conclusion appears to be sound and they are definitely correct in refusing to force Hosea's free verse into uniform and symmetrical patterns.

As already stated, more attention to ancient near Eastern texts could have been wished for. To illustrate this point we will look at a difficult verse, ch.13.12, "Ephraim's iniquity is in bonds, his sin is hidden". This is not a metaphor for "the removal of idols to safe storage" (p638), nor is it "a completely self-contained oracle." Coming in a catalogue of sins (cf. Wolff) it refers, in fact, to unabsolved sin. Akkadian incantations also provide exhaustive lists of crimes and repeat invocations such as "may the god absolve (lit. undo)". Such catalogues were intended to include even sins committed unknowingly, which accounts for the expression "hidden" in Hosea. A. and F. have assembled the data: lists of sins (p435) and of similes (Akkadian incantations also used similes in series) but the data need interpreting.

Use of Ugaritic material is sparse and, at least once, incorrect. The

word translated "necklace" (p261) really means "bull-headed lyre". Note, also, the term translated "speaker" (Prov 14.5,25; p602) has long been shown to mean "witness", as in Ugaritic. In the discussion of the technical word "fee" (p523), no account is taken of the same word in Ugaritic (used in a snake incantation).

The statement "the figure of raining down righteousness is not found elsewhere" (p568 on 10.12) is evidently an oversight; cf Isa 45.8. The bibliography runs to thirty pages but is incomplete; items that could be added include Deller, *Biblica* 46 (1965) 349-52 on 12.2 and van Selms, *ZAW* 85 (1973) 332-39 on Isa 28.9ff.

The authors are eminent in the field of ancient languages and there is no denying this commentary is a substantial contribution to the study of Hosea. The approach they have adopted is evidently to play down comparison with extra-biblical material and concentrate on the Hebrew of Hosea. The result is a detailed analysis of vocabulary and style which deserves a place on the bookshelves of OT scholars.

Trinity College  
Dublin

Wilfred G.E. Watson

J.C. Beker, Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought

T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh 1980 pp xi + 452

This is not the customary rehash of Pauline theology with carefully divided sections on Paul's view of Christ, man, the church etc., but an attempt to present Paul as a whole from a new angle. Beker turns away from both the anthropological approach associated with Bultmann and the christological approach emphasized by Cullmann and argues instead that Paul is to be regarded primarily as a theologian, i.e., a man who writes about God. Thus he posits "the triumph of God as the coherent theme of Paul's Gospel; that is, the hope in the dawning victory of God and in the imminent redemption of the created order which he has inaugurated in Christ" (p136). Apocalyptic is not just the framework in which Paul's thought moves but is itself of the core of that thought. "...apocalyptic revolves around three basic ideas: (1) historic dualism; (2) universal cosmic expectation; and (3) the imminent end of the world" (p136). "Paul's apocalyptic dualism is not a Gnostic dualism of contempt for this world, or otherworldliness. It is determined by the event of Christ.... It aims to transform the cosmos rather than to confirm its ontological nothingness" (p149).

How does Beker come to this position? He sees an interplay between this central idea and the ways in which it is expressed in different letters; he takes Romans, 1,2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, Philemon to be genuine. There is a coherence of thought between the letters, as defined above, and an important element of contingency in each letter. Paul is not a systematic theologian; in particular, Romans is not a systematic working out of his central theme.



Since the time of A. Schweitzer many interpreters have seen the apocalyptic nature of Paul's thought and seeing it have sought to evade it. From the beginning of the second century, if not earlier, the church has feared apocalyptic eschatology, and this has not changed with the twentieth century. Bultmann attempted to demythologize the apocalyptic world view and produced an existential interpretation, turning statements about God into statements about man. Dodd eliminated the apocalyptic element in Paul by arguing for a realized eschatology emerging in the later Pauline letters and seeing that as his basic position. Much neo-orthodoxy laid so much stress on the cross and resurrection of Christ as the mid-point of history that the end-point of the consummation became relatively unimportant. Even much earlier in the Patristic period "the interest" shifted "from the resurrection status and the imminent return of the Son of God at the right hand of God to the relation between the Father and the Son in pre-existence" (p158). Ontology replaced eschatology.

Serious questions raise themselves at this point. Was the Patristic discussion a deviation from true Christianity or is it the expression of true Christianity within a Hellenistic philosophical culture? Our culture is not an apocalyptic culture, though it might become one again: do we therefore meanwhile throw Paul away as an interpreter of Christianity? If "imminent" (Beker's attempt to escape "imminence" by writing of "theological necessity" (p178) is not very helpful) is an essential part of the apocalyptic outlook, if the world has gone on much beyond Paul's time and if we are no longer able to think in terms of an imminent end then what does this do to Paul's apocalyptic approach? Beker uses Paul's apocalyptic view to criticize other NT books (e.g. Ephesians, p163, Matthew, p248f) and these are marked off by their divergence from Paul; is Paul then the centre of the canon? Does Paul's world view belong to the core of the Gospel or can the core be expressed in terms of other world views? Finally, has Beker excluded any one other than the academic from understanding Paul by his emphasis on apocalypticism or are the many sects which place apocalyptic expectation in the forefront of their views able to understand Paul better than the mainline denominations?

These are questions that are left unanswered; no matter how they are answered there is no doubt that Beker has made an important and exciting contribution to Pauline studies. By clearly recognizing the element of contingency in the letters he has allowed Paul to speak for himself in his own terms and not within the framework of some systematic position which we have evolved for our own use and for the purposes of systematic theology. He has also shown how the contingent letters cohere. His stress on Paul as a theologian rather than an anthropologist or a christologist must be especially welcomed as must also the way in which he brings out the relation of Christ to the created order, the cosmos as a whole, and not just to personal sin. He has refused to speculate on Paul as a religious personality. Many of these features are not new, but they have been brought together in a new and massive re-interpretation which will force us to rethink our views on Paul

This commentary on Romans, first published in German in 1973, represents the crowning achievement of one the greatest Lutheran interpreters of Paul. In order to understand and appreciate Käsemann's exegesis and theological perspectives one must needs see him in context. He never does exegesis in a vacuum, but is for ever in confrontation with past or present scholarship. He sees himself not as a neutral, disinterested academic but as a defender of the faith whose responsibility is to ensure a proper understanding of Paul for today.

Much of his interpretation of Pauline theology represents a revision of Bultmann's existentialist acosmic theology with its overemphasis on the individual, hence his stress on apocalyptic and the "extra nos" of salvation. Käsemann's own theological interest is evidenced by his failure to carry out his original commission to revise Lietzmann's "Handbuch" (rather than write a new commentary). He found himself unable to do this partly because he regards the work of his predecessor, within the limits of its own aim and premises, as unsurpassable. But it was also partly because he could not follow in his footsteps "without denying himself and what are for him present day realities and needs". Thus whilst nothing from historical scholarship that is essential is withheld, Käsemann's own emphasis is on what Paul meant theologically. His awareness of the provisional nature of the solutions offered by theology at any moment in time is not the reason for lack of interest in the purely historical reference. The reverse is, in fact, the case. The provisional nature of all theological solutions or judgments does not release us from, but rather obligates us to unceasing labour (pviif).

Käsemann has mixed feelings about the contribution of F.C. Baur. It was the merit of Baur that he broke through the dogmatic approach with his question as to the historical situation. At the same time he plunged interpretation into difficulties that have not yet been mastered (p402). When his systematic conception of the antithesis between Jewish particularism and Pauline universalism broke down, scholarship failed to focus on Rom. 9-11 as it should have done, thus finding it increasingly difficult to do justice to the unity of the epistle. By giving Romans an historical setting in the life of primitive Christianity, Baur removed from its hinges, as subsequent scholarship showed, the traditional doctrine of justification, at least within the German speaking world. Only recently has the lost centrality of the doctrine been restored. The fact that the "Jewish heritage of the apostle has increasingly shown itself to be the native ground, and eschatology the horizon of his theology" has greatly assisted the recovery (P253-4).

It goes without saying that Käsemann's theological conviction as to the centrality of justification by faith will be evident in his interpretation of Romans. Apart from the introduction and conclusion, the titles of the six main sections include the key word "righteousness" i.e., The Need for the Revelation of the Righteousness of God (1.18-3.20); The Righteousness of God as the Righteousness of Faith (3.21-4.25); The Righteousness of Faith as a Reality of Eschatological

Freedom (5.1-8.39), The Righteousness of God and the Problem of Israel (9.1-11.36) and The Righteousness of God in Daily Christian Life (12.1-15.13). The theme of Romans is to be found in 1.16-17 and the theme, argument and outcome of the entire epistle designate it as "a uniquely modified Jewish-Christian apocalyptic" (p34). Its whole message may be summarized in the brief but paradoxical statement that the Son of God is, as our Kurios, the one eschatological gift of God to us and that herein is revealed simultaneously both God's legitimate claim on us and also our salvation. The phrase "righteousness of God" means "the God who brings back the fallen world into the sphere of his legitimate claim whether in promise or demand" (p29).

Käsemann's opposition to the tendency to absolutize righteousness as a divine gift has led him to stress the indissoluble connection between gift and power in Paul. "Charis" is God's gracious power as well as his gift. The gift itself is seen as the "presence of the giver" who demands obedience so that a transformation of existence is brought about by a change of lordship. Käsemann's understanding of righteousness has not gone unchallenged but, minor modifications apart, it is at the moment in the ascendancy. M.T. Brauch, for example, in a recent article indicates in his closing remarks that "God's power is for the world, and the world's salvation consists in the fact that it is led back under God's dominion. 'Dikaïosunē theou' is 'Heilsetzende Macht' (salvation-creating power). This final observation in Käsemann's essay may well be used as a summary of the recent German discussion." ("Perspectives on God's Righteousness in Recent German Discussion", Appendix to E.P. Sanders' book, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, London 1977, p541). It is in some measure at least due to Käsemann's own contribution that "the doctrine of justification is today recognized even across confessional boundaries as an inalienable constituent of Paul's theology." (p24)

In view of this lengthy discussion of Paul's theology in Romans, one might well ask whether Käsemann has ignored Baur's stress on the historical situation. This is not so: although the letter presents a summary of Paul's theology, it remains like his other writings a document of a particular situation. (p390). Due to mistrust and suspicion concerning both his person and his work as an apostle, Paul can only speak clearly about his plans and concerns in the epilogue for which the whole epistle is a preparation. "The proper starting point is that Paul is presenting himself and his central message to the Roman congregation as yet unknown to him." (p404f) Paul needs the Roman Christians "as a springboard, if not an operational base, for his missionary plans in the west." He is not summoning them to participate in the collection but relations with them could have a bearing on his Jerusalem visit. Thus "the real problem of the text and therewith the purpose of writing lies in the combination of Rome, Jerusalem and Spain, and if the importance of the last two factors is sufficiently recognized, in the mediating function of Rome" (p405). Moreover if Paul through his letter could win over the Roman church and especially its Jewish-Christian minority, or at least dispel their existing suspicions, he could get rearguard protection in relation to Jerusalem too. The latter factor explains why Paul stresses the course of salvation history and the salvation of all Israel, why he is so mild and accommodating to Jewish Christians concerning observance of days, and why he bases his gospel so firmly on scripture from which he too derives his world mission.



The issue at stake is whether Käsemann has fully dovetailed together his theological interpretation of the letter and the specific situation in chs 13-15. Schmithals considers he has not. He complains that Käsemann's views concerning the actual historical situation are a poorly thought through conglomeration of old opinions. How Paul with a letter which, without qualification, must be seen as directed to Gentile Christians, can hope to win a Jewish-Christian minority, remains Käsemann's secret. (Der Römerbrief als historisches Problem, Gütersloh 1975, p50)

To be fair to Käsemann, however, he does stress that Romans is not a theological tractate but he does seek to take into account the numerous proposals concerning the occasion and aim of the letter. The fact that there was no provision in the "Handbuch" series for footnotes has meant that Käsemann has been forced (not without some misgivings) to include references to authors in parentheses in the text. This can prove irksome since the brevity of reference often leaves one in doubt as to how the opinion cited relates to Käsemann's own view.

Another possible criticism concerns the proper understanding of law and gospel in Romans. Does Käsemann's "Lutheran" emphasis on law and gospel as mutually exclusive (p282), his interpretation of *telos* as end, and his relegation of law entirely to the old aeon provide adequate explanation for such phrases as "the law of faith", or "the law of the Spirit"? Does it fully accord with his own outline of chs 7-8 as "the End of the Law in the Power of the Spirit"? It might also be questioned whether Käsemann stresses sufficiently in Romans the positive continuity in salvation history due to the divine faithfulness, and whether as a result he is not unduly negative in his depiction of Judaism. E.P. Sanders (op.cit.) has shown how easy it is to misrepresent Rabbinic religion as entirely a religion of works. Recently M. Barth has criticized the tendency of Käsemann and other NT scholars to see "the pious Jew" as the apostle's adversary ("St Paul - A Good Jew", Horizons in Biblical Theology, 1, 1979 p7f). Käsemann's intention is to be consistently and thoroughly christological. He attacks both individualism and exaggerated anthropological emphases. Salvation is never "mere inwardness", nor simply a "new self-understanding", but God's reclaiming of the world for his control through the Cross of Christ. Thus the "I" of Rom 7.7-13 is taken to refer to human experience before or apart from Christ as viewed from a human perspective. This concurs with Sander's claim that Paul only comes to regard Judaism as inadequate after his new revelation of God in Christ on the way to Damascus.

Those who wish to know what scholars are saying about Paul's gospel and theology, those who need detailed interpretation of the NT for preaching, and those students who are studying the NT for the first time will find this commentary an indispensable tool. However much we agree or disagree with the stance taken, we cannot but be thankful for a great scholar who has once again helped to break down the barriers between the first and the twentieth centuries and brought the message of Paul vividly to our attention.

James D.G. Dunn, Christology in the Making, An Inquiry into the Origins  
of the Doctrine of the Incarnation

SCM Press 1980

ppxvii + 443

£10.50

The subject of this book was conceived in the wake of the controversy aroused by the appearance of a group of essays under the title "The Myth of God Incarnate" (Ed. by J. Hicks, SCM Press 1977), when the popular view, supported by a number of scholars, was that the divinity of Jesus as being called into question. The controversy has, at least to some extent, been muted and interest flagged. For those who look for definitive or clear-cut answers on the person of Jesus, this book will be a disappointment but for those who wish for a cautious and informed approach which takes into account recent writing (its bibliography is massive) and is not too eager to rush after conclusions, it should be welcomed.

"God and Man in two distinct natures and one Person for ever" - this is a phrase, culled from the memory banks, fed into through Sunday School days when the Shorter Catechism had to be learnt by heart and, so often, accepted unthinkingly and by rote. Today it appears as a remarkably confident statement. No doubt it can be explained as a development from what was implicit in the Church's understanding of Jesus, and some of the stages of that development can be traced in the NT, e.g., we can think of the contrast between the phrase from Peter's speech "God made him Lord and Christ" (Acts 2.36) and that in Col 2.9: "For in him the whole fulness of deity dwells bodily"; or, again, we can think of the "I am" of Jesus (Mark (6.50; 13.6; 14.62) which can be merely an affirmative statement (cf Dunn, p23) and the highly developed "I am" of Jesus on numerous occasions in the Fourth Gospel.

The title of the book makes it clear that it is concerned with "Origins", and not with the end product. Dr Dunn follows an order of discussion which he explains and seeks to justify (p7f): "Son of God" first as the central and decisive christological title, suggesting a heavenly figure; and then "Son of Man", a natural contrast and appropriately a heavenly figure in Daniel 7.13; "Son of Man" and "Adam" link up in Hebrew idiom, hence the discussion on Adam; from this to Spirit, like angels, an intermediary between God and men; then to Wisdom and, as perhaps deriving from Wisdom speculation, the Logos or Word of God. It appears a reasonable order but does not quite avoid the problem of departmentalizing the discussion a danger of which he is well aware (p8)

In view of the seemingly interminable and often unrewarding discussions in christology especially in the synoptic Gospels, it may well be wondered if anything new can be said. Can we, for example, find the self-consciousness of Jesus as divine Son in the voice at the baptism or in what T.W. Manson suggested about the intimacy of Jesus' use of "Abba" or are we to declare it a waste of time to make such an inquiry? Does "Son of Man" merely mean "man", or is it the Church's way of singling out the unique and remarkable person Jesus was to whom it must confine the distinctive term "Son of Man"? Or, again, does Jesus base his use of it on Daniel 7.13 or does it have links with the ebed Yahweh, as Jeremias, among others, argues? Dr Dunn is prepared to concede that Jesus' use of Abba does suggest a sense of intimate sonship but cannot give a firm answer to the



question - was it a sense of divine sonship? Dr Dunn approaches the evidence of the Fourth Gospel with great wariness. His caution is fully justified. No scholar today can afford to neglect the implications of Käsemann's "Testament of Jesus" for Johannine christology, where he conceives of a Jesus so divine that he ceases any longer to be truly human, a docetic Jesus, a veritable "God striding on earth". Of course the picture is over-drawn (John refuses to let go the expressions of the human Jesus - a point not sufficiently considered by Käsemann?). Yet there is sufficient truth in it for most scholars, evangelical and conservative, to agree with Dr Dunn when he suggests that it would verge on the irresponsible to use the Johannine testimony on Jesus' divine sonship to sift out the self-consciousness of Jesus himself (p31).

Dr Dunn also exercises commendable restraint when it comes to the matter of the pre-existence (all too easily read into the NT by a number of scholars) of Jesus. How many sermons have we read or heard on "God sent his son, made of a woman..." which assumed pre-existence rather than a parallel with "there was a man sent from God whose name was John" (Gal 4.4 and John 1.5)? And how frequently do we get the Jewish idea of pre-existence confused with that of the Church, viz, as existing before the creation and frequently the assumption, that because it is pre-existent, it means it is divine. Yet no Jew understood pre-existent probably as more than a way of showing how highly God esteemed e.g. Wisdom or the Torah. Yet the precise point in time when the Church saw Jesus as the pre-existent Divine Son is hard to discover. Is the view of Jesus as pre-existent Son absent from Mark as Dr Dunn suggests? What of the strange quotation, "Behold, I send my messenger before your face" (1.1)? Is this form of the quotation, shaped to apply to Jesus by the Church, merely referring to Jesus' mission or is it conceived, as Grundmann suggests, as applying to the pre-existent Son and, when the Church used it as a testimonium, was that its understanding? And what of the equally strange statement, "It was for this I came out" (1.38)? But the eternal co-existence presupposed in, "In the beginning was the Logos and the Logos was with God and the Logos was God" is probably the highest christological point in the NT and it may, in the light of this, be truer to say that the divine sonship of Jesus is grounded in this eternal co-existence rather than pre-existence (As Dr Dunn suggests, p58) though whether we need to say it, given eternal co-existence, is doubtful.

There is one other point this book raises and that is the extent to which we are justified in using the typology of Adam to understand what Paul writes. Are we to assume it in Romans 1.18ff in the discussion on the universality of sin as Dr Dunn (following others) does? Or is it the key to unlock the meaning of the pre-Pauline hymn in Philippians 2.5ff? If Paul wants to use the Adam analogy does he not make it quite clear in Romans 5.12ff and in 1 Cor 15 and why does it become cryptic in Rom 1.18ff and Phil 2.6ff? There is no question that to interpret the latter in the light of the Genesis account is attractive and should probably not be ignored in any interpretation but the basic puzzle remains - why does Paul not make it clear here as he does elsewhere?

Dr Dunn is to be congratulated on an able and courageous attempt to deal with the exceedingly elusive world of christological origins. He deals with it sensitively and honestly to every reader's benefit.

Union Theological College, Belfast

E.A. Russell



Raimundo Panikkar, The Unknown Christ of Hinduism,

Darton, Longman & Todd 1981

£5.95 (New edition)

Father Panikkar was born in Barcelona in 1918, the son of a Hindu father and a Spanish Catholic mother - as he himself once said - "wholly Indian and wholly Spanish!" This background, and the writer's scholarly reputation as a Professor of Comparative Religion in places as far apart as Varanasi (Benares) and Harvard, might well encourage us to turn the pages of this challengingly-entitled book. We might begin by savouring the parable (p30) of the green, white and orange (saffron) light; and then, if in search of homiletical material, we might well decide to borrow or to buy the book, if only for the ten fascinating theses (pp102-105), each beginning, "If God exists...."

A summary and critique of the first edition of this book appeared in Dr Robin Boyd's authoritative and encyclopaedic Introduction to Indian Christian Theology (Christian Literature Society, Madras, 1969). In its original form, the book was an extended commentary on an aphorism or Sutra at the beginning of the Brahma-Sutra, a famous Hindu scripture, probably of the fourth century BC. The aphorism in question tells us that it is from Brahman (The Absolute, Being-in-itself) that the origin, preservation and dissolution of this world proceed. Panikkar asks how Brahman, which is, by definition, self-sufficient and unconditioned by anything, can enter into relation with the relativities of this world. His answer - something of a tour de force - is that it does this through Ishvar, the personal God, who, though himself of "Brahman" status, is in a position to relate to our world. According to Panikkar, Ishvar is functionally equivalent to Christ, the Creative Word or Logos, in that he is the link between the Absolute Godhead and the world; and though this does not authorize a syncretistic synthesis between Hinduism and Christianity, it does most certainly indicate common ground for fruitful dialogue between them.

As Dr Boyd has pointed out, the soundness of this deeply interesting thesis depends on the ontological status of Ishvar in relation to Brahman. Is this really the same as that of Christ in relation to God? Many Christian students would still say that Ishvar and Brahman are definitely not "of the same substance, equal in power and glory."

The additional matter in this new edition - nearly one hundred pages out of a total of some one hundred and seventy - raises further questions about the main title of the book. We can go a long way with the idea of a hidden work of Christ outside the visible Church. But to regard the religion of Hinduism as a preparation for Christ is quite another matter. Many theologians of the Reformed tradition would prefer to say, with Barth, Niebuhr and Bonhoeffer, that Jesus Christ is the crisis of all "religions", Hinduism and Christianity included.

Despite these reservations, this difficult, sometimes controversial, but always stimulating book can be recommended to all readers seriously concerned with the theology of religion or with missiology. The concluding discussion of the doctrine of the Trinity (pp148-162) is especially worthwhile, and of interest to a wider readership.

